

Bibliometrics Analysis Report

A bibliometric analysis of tourists' experience and happiness in tourism (2000-2024)

Author1 Chungil Chae* (corresponding author)

Sat, 1 March 2025

Ver1.0

Overview of the Report

Bibliometrics

Overview

Main Information

Description

- Timespan and Growth:

- The dataset spans from **1992 to 2025** with an **annual growth rate of 12.59%**.
- There are **1553 documents** contributing to this dataset.

- Document Metrics:

- **Average citations per document** is **30.05**, indicating a relatively high citation impact.
- **Document Average Age** is **4.37 years**, suggesting many publications are relatively recent.
- A total of **70,323 references** were cited across all documents.

- Keywords:

- **Keywords Plus (ID)** total **2269**, while **Author's Keywords (DE)** total **4512**.
- This indicates a broad range of topical coverage and suggests authors employ a wide variety of terms to describe their work.

Description	Results
MAIN INFORMATION ABOUT DATA	NA
Timespan	1992:2025
Sources (Journals, Books, etc)	92
Documents	1553
Annual Growth Rate %	12.59
Document Average Age	4.37
Average citations per doc	30.05
References	70323
DOCUMENT CONTENTS	NA
Keywords Plus (ID)	2269
Author's Keywords (DE)	4512
AUTHORS	NA
Authors	3258
Authors of single-authored docs	146
AUTHORS COLLABORATION	NA
Single-authored docs	160
Co-Authors per Doc	3.02
International co-authorships %	39.73
DOCUMENT TYPES	NA
article	1359
article; early access	124
article; proceedings paper	2
article; retracted publication	1
editorial material; early access	1
review	60
review; early access	6

26 • **Authors and Collaboration:**

- 27 – There are **3258 authors** in total. Of these, **146** are authors of single-authored documents, and
28 there are **160 single-authored documents**.
- 29 – The average **Co-Authors per Document** is **3.02**, showing moderate teamwork on publications.
- 30 – **39.73%** of the documents involve **international co-authorship**, highlighting a significant level
31 of global collaboration.

32 • **Document Types:**

- 33 – The majority are **articles (1359)**, followed by:
34 * **article; early access:** 124
35 * **review:** 60
36 * **review; early access:** 6
37 * Smaller numbers for proceedings papers, editorial material, and one retracted publication.

38 **Interpretation**

- 39 • The **robust annual growth rate (12.59%)** from 1992 to 2025 reflects an expanding research area,
40 with increasing numbers of publications.
- 41 • The relatively **young average age (4.37 years)** of the documents implies that the field is actively
42 publishing new studies or is experiencing a surge of recent interest.
- 43 • A **high average citation rate (30.05)** points to the significance or influence of these studies,
44 indicating that the research outputs are resonating within the scholarly community.
- 45 • The **large number of references (70,323)** suggests that authors are building upon extensive prior
46 knowledge, indicative of a well-established research base.

47 • **Collaboration metrics:**

- 48 – An average of **3.02 co-authors per document** indicates moderate teamwork among researchers.
- 49 – **39.73% international co-authorship** underscores a noteworthy global dimension to this
50 research area, suggesting both the relevance and collaborative nature of the topic.
- 51 • The **predominance of articles** shows that the main mode of dissemination is through empirical or
52 theoretical research papers, while the presence of **reviews** (66 in total) indicates ongoing efforts to
53 synthesize existing knowledge.

54 **Conclusion & Summary**

66 Overall, these findings reveal a **dynamically growing field** with a **steady increase** in publications over
67 the past few decades. **High citation averages** and a **diverse, global collaborative network** underscore
68 the field's academic importance. The dominance of **articles** among document types and the variety in
69 **keywords** highlight broad research engagement and topical exploration.

70 **In summary**, the field demonstrates strong growth, collaborative spirit, and robust impact in terms of
71 citation—signaling a vibrant and evolving scholarly community.

72 **Annual Scientific Production**

73 **Description**

74 • **Gradual Emergence (1992–2005):**

75 The number of articles is very low in the early years, ranging from 0 to 2 per year, with a small uptick
76 to 5 in 2006.

77 • **Steady Uptick (2006–2015):**

78 From 2006 onward, there is a gradual climb in publications:

79 – 5 articles in 2006

80 – 10 articles by 2010

81 – 29 articles by 2015

82 • **Significant Surge (2016–2024):**

83 The publication count shows a substantial rise during this period:

84 – 53 articles in 2016

85 – 98 in 2019

86 – 142 in 2020

87 – 191 in 2022

88 – 342 in 2024

89 • **Partial Data or Drop in 2025:**

90 After a record high in 2024 (342 articles), the count is **50** in 2025, which might indicate data for 2025
91 is **incomplete** or still being collected.

92 **Interpretation**

93 • **Growing Research Interest:**

94 The rise from single-digit publications in the early 2000s to over 300 in 2024 highlights increasing
95 global interest and research efforts in this field or topic.

102 • **Accelerating Publication Rate:**

103 The jump from 2015 to 2024 suggests not just incremental growth but an accelerating pace of output,
104 possibly due to:


- 105 – Increased funding or recognition of the field's importance
106 – More collaborative networks and open-access channels
107 – Ongoing technological or theoretical breakthroughs leading to higher publication productivity
108

110 • **Fluctuation in Latest Year (2025):**

111 The sharp decline to 50 articles in 2025 likely reflects partial data for the year. If the pattern holds,
112 the final count for 2025 may approach or exceed previous totals once data collection is complete.

113 **Conclusion & Summary**

114 In summary, the **annual scientific production** has shown a marked **upward trajectory** over the past
115 decades, reflecting growing engagement and collaboration in this research area. The lower 2025 figure
116 is likely due to incomplete data rather than a genuine downturn. Overall, the trend underscores a **maturing**
117 **field with increasing scholarly attention** and output.



118

Year	Articles
1992	1
1993	0
1994	0
1995	1
1996	1
1997	0
1998	0
1999	0
2000	0
2001	1
2002	1
2003	2
2004	2
2005	1
2006	5
2007	2
2008	8
2009	9
2010	10
2011	11
2012	18
2013	25
2014	24
2015	29
2016	53
2017	65
2018	58
2019	98
2020	142
2021	162
2022	191
2023	241
2024	342
2025	50

¹¹⁹ **Average Citations per Year**

¹²⁰ **Description**

- **Mean Total Citations per Article (MeanTCperArt):**

- Higher values appear in earlier years (e.g., **178** in 1996, **195** in 2004), while more recent years show much lower values (e.g., **3.13** in 2024, **1.44** in 2025).

- This reflects the **longer timespan** older articles have had to accumulate citations.

- **Number of Articles (N):**

- Sparse in the early years (often **1** or **2** articles).

- **Substantial increase** in later years, with **342** articles in 2024 and **50** in 2025 (notable jump compared to single digits in the 1990s).

- **Mean Citations per Year (MeanTCperYear):**

- Fluctuates from **2.88** (1992) to peaks around **8.86** (2004) and **8.14** (2011).

- Generally, older articles show higher mean citations per year, likely indicating influential or foundational research.

- **Citable Years:**

- The table shows a **gradually decreasing number** of citable years as the publication date moves closer to the present (e.g., **34** citable years for 1992 vs. **1** for 2025).

- This aligns with the notion that newer articles simply haven't had as much time to be cited.

¹⁴¹ **Interpretation**

- **Influence of Older Publications:**

Articles from the 1990s and early 2000s show high average citations, suggesting they may be **seminal works** or foundational studies that have consistently been cited over decades.

- **Citation Accumulation Over Time:**

The **longer an article has been available**, the more citations it tends to accumulate. Hence, recent publications (especially post-2020) naturally exhibit lower citation counts and lower mean citation rates.

- **Rapid Growth of Publications:**

A **significant increase** in the number of articles in the 2010s and early 2020s indicates **expanding research activity**. More scholars entering the field and greater research funding can lead to a higher volume of new work, though these new papers typically need time to garner citations.


- **Disparities in Citation Rates:**

Some specific years (e.g., 1996, 2004) show unusually high average citations, possibly indicating **particularly influential articles** published in those years.

Year	MeanTCperArt	N	MeanTCperYear	CitableYears
1992	98.00	1	2.88	34
1995	83.00	1	2.68	31
1996	178.00	1	5.93	30
2001	41.00	1	1.64	25
2002	39.00	1	1.62	24
2003	59.50	2	2.59	23
2004	195.00	2	8.86	22
2005	25.00	1	1.19	21
2006	94.00	5	4.70	20
2007	140.50	2	7.39	19
2008	146.38	8	8.13	18
2009	89.89	9	5.29	17
2010	86.30	10	5.39	16
2011	122.09	11	8.14	15
2012	82.22	18	5.87	14
2013	106.88	25	8.22	13
2014	82.21	24	6.85	12
2015	74.97	29	6.82	11
2016	77.38	53	7.74	10
2017	66.32	65	7.37	9
2018	51.64	58	6.46	8
2019	48.71	98	6.96	7
2020	35.70	142	5.95	6
2021	29.99	162	6.00	5
2022	14.62	191	3.65	4
2023	10.05	241	3.35	3
2024	3.13	342	1.56	2
2025	1.44	50	1.44	1

¹⁵⁶ **Conclusion & Summary**

¹⁵⁷ In summary, **older publications have accrued more citations** and thus show higher average totals and
¹⁵⁸ yearly citation rates. Meanwhile, the **volume of recent publications** has grown substantially, but these
¹⁵⁹ newer papers have had **less time to gather citations**. Consequently, the dataset shows a **maturing field**
¹⁶⁰ where both the **quantity of research** and the **range of citation impacts** continue to expand.



161

162 **Sources**

163 **Most Relevant Sources**

164 **Description**

165 • **Top 5 Sources:**

- 166 1. **Tourism Management** leads with **108** articles.
- 167 2. **Journal of Travel Research** (97)
- 168 3. **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** (96)
- 169 4. **Current Issues in Tourism** (90)
- 170 5. **Annals of Tourism Research** (73)

171 • **Next Tier of Journals:**

- 172 – **International Journal of Tourism Research** (69), **Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management** (55), **Tourism Management Perspectives** (51), **Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research** (49), and **International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management** (46) also feature prominently.

173 • **Moderate Contribution:**

- 174 – A range of journals contribute between **10 and 40 articles**, such as **Journal of Destination Marketing & Management** (42) and **Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing** (41).
- 175 – Several niche or regionally focused journals (e.g., **Anatolia-International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research**, **Tourism and Hospitality Research**) have counts in the teens or single digits.

176 • **Long Tail of Sources:**

- 177 – Many journals have **fewer than 10 articles**. These include specialized outlets (e.g., **Journal of Ecotourism**, **Tourist Studies**) and multidisciplinary journals that occasionally cover tourism themes (e.g., **European Sport Management Quarterly**, **Sport in Society**).
- 178 – A handful of publications feature only **1 or 2 articles**, likely representing specialized or newer outlets.

179 **Interpretation**

180 • **Dominance of Core Tourism Journals:**

181 The **top five** clearly include **major tourism research outlets**, underscoring their leadership and high visibility in the field. Their prominence indicates that they are **go-to journals** for scholars seeking to disseminate influential work.

199 • **Diverse Publication Platforms:**

200 The broad spread of journals, from dedicated tourism/hospitality outlets to interdisciplinary publications
201 (e.g., **International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching**, **Sport Management Review**),
202 reflects the **multidisciplinary nature** of tourism research. Scholars engage with tourism in relation
203 to **hospitality, recreation, heritage, and sports**, indicating cross-field collaboration.

204 • **Global and Niche Perspectives:**

205 Journals such as **Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research** highlight **regional focuses**, while others
206 (e.g., **Tourism Geographies**, **Tourist Studies**) emphasize specific thematic or methodological lenses.
207 This diversity shows the field's richness and its multiple research avenues.

208 • **Emerging or Specialized Outlets:**

209 Outlets with **fewer articles** likely represent **emerging journals**, specialized niches, or newly indexed
210 publications. They can still be influential within particular subfields or geographic contexts.

211 **Conclusion & Summary**

212 Overall, **Tourism Management**, **Journal of Travel Research**, and **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** head
213 the list, illustrating their central roles in the dissemination of tourism scholarship. The breadth of titles
214 confirms the **multidisciplinary, global scope** of research in tourism and hospitality, encompassing both
215 highly specialized and more general outlets.

216 **In summary**, these data underscore the core journals that carry the bulk of tourism research output, as well
217 as the growing ecosystem of **specialized or interdisciplinary publications** contributing to the field.

218 **Most Local Cited Sources**

219 **Description**

220 • **Top-Tier Citations:**

- 221 – **Tourism Management** (TOURISM MANAGE) tops the list with **7,488** local citations,
222 followed by
- 223 – **Annals of Tourism Research** (ANN TOURISM RES) with **7,041**,
- 224 – **Journal of Travel Research** entries combined (abbreviated as J TRAVEL RES = 3,793 and
225 spelled out as JOURNAL OF TRAVEL RESEARCH = 1,589) total over **5,300** citations if
226 considered together,
- 227 – **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** also appears twice (J SUSTAIN TOUR = 2,411 and JOUR-
228 NAL OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM = 423), suggesting a large overall impact.

229 • **Key Tourism and Hospitality Outlets:**

230 Besides the highest-cited titles above, other influential journals include **Current Issues in Tourism**
231 (**CURR ISSUES TOUR** = 1,709), **International Journal of Hospitality Management** (1,682), **Interna-**
232 **tional Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management** (1,311), and **Tourism Manage-**
233 **ment Perspectives** (1,088).

237 • **Interdisciplinary and Methodological Sources:**

238 Noteworthy entries from broader disciplines include:

239 – **Journal of Business Research (1,152)**

240 – **Social Indicators Research (726)**

241 – **Psychological Bulletin (519)**

242 – **Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective (240)**

243 – **Structural Equation Modeling (115)**

244 – **Science (107)**

245 These highlight cross-disciplinary influences and methodological underpinnings within tourism
246 research.
247

248 • **Diverse Topic Coverage:**

249 Several other psychology or marketing journals, like **Journal of Consumer Research**, **Journal of
250 Applied Psychology**, and **Journal of Marketing**, each exceed 400 local citations. There is also rep-
251 resentation from **sustainability** (Sustainability-Basel, 971; Ecological Economics, 155), indicating
252 an environmental focus within tourism research.

253 • **Overlap in Abbreviated vs. Full Journal Titles:**

254 Some journals appear under both abbreviated and full titles (e.g., **J TRAVEL RES** and **JOURNAL
255 OF TRAVEL RESEARCH**), artificially splitting their total citations.
256

257 **Interpretation**

258 1. **Central Role of Specialized Tourism Journals:**

259 • The dominance of **Tourism Management** and **Annals of Tourism Research** confirms their
260 status as **leading authorities** in tourism scholarship.
261

262 • When combined, different listings for **Journal of Travel Research** and **Journal of Sustainable
263 Tourism** confirm they also command high local citations, placing them squarely among the
264 discipline's core references.
265

266 2. **Significance of Interdisciplinary Support:**

267 • The presence of **business, psychology, and sustainability** journals (e.g., *Journal of Business
268 Research*, *Psychological Bulletin*, *Sustainability-Basel*) underscores the **multidisciplinary
269 nature** of tourism studies.
270

271 • Researchers frequently draw on marketing and psychological theories, as well as sustainability
272 frameworks, to inform tourism-based inquiries.
273

274 3. **Methodological Foundation:**

- 276 • Citations to **Multivariate Data Analysis** and **Structural Equation Modeling** reflect that **quantitative, rigorous statistical approaches** are widely employed in tourism research, emphasizing sophisticated analysis techniques.
- 277
- 278


279 **4. Possibility of Citation Inflation via Duplicate Entries:**

- 280 • Some journals (e.g., J TRAVEL RES vs. JOURNAL OF TRAVEL RESEARCH) appear twice, indicating that aggregated citations would be higher if merged.
- 281
- 282
- 283 • This duplication suggests that authors may cite the same source using different abbreviations, reflecting standard inconsistencies in bibliographic data.
- 284

285 **Conclusion & Summary**

286 Overall, **Tourism Management**, **Annals of Tourism Research**, and **Journal of Travel Research** (in both
287 abbreviated and full forms) are at the forefront, reflecting their longstanding influence. The dataset also
288 shows a **broad interdisciplinary reach**, with high citation counts for psychology, business, and sustain-
289 ability journals. Further, the usage of advanced research methods is evident, pointing to a **mature and**
290 **methodologically robust** field.

291 **In summary**, these citation patterns underscore the **central role of leading tourism journals**, the **cross-
292 disciplinary integrations** shaping the field, and the **methodological depth** that tourism scholars employ
293 in their research.



Sources	Articles
TOURISM MANAGE	7488
ANN TOURISM RES	7041
J TRAVEL RES	3793
J SUSTAIN TOUR	2411
CURR ISSUES TOUR	1709
INT J HOSP MANAG	1682
JOURNAL OF TRAVEL RESEARCH	1589
INT J CONTEMP HOSP M	1311
J TRAVEL TOUR MARK	1221
J BUS RES	1152
TOUR MANAG PERSPECT	1088
INT J TOUR RES	1066
SUSTAINABILITY-BASEL	971
J HOSP TOUR MANAG	913
J DESTIN MARK MANAGE	897
J PERS SOC PSYCHOL	850
J HOSP TOUR RES	780
TOURISM GEOGR	732
SOC INDIC RES	726
TOUR REV	658
ASIA PAC J TOUR RES	639
J HAPPINESS STUD	576
J MARKETING RES	541
J LEISURE RES	529
TOUR RECREAT RES	525
PSYCHOL BULL	519
J HOSP MARKET MANAG	509
LEISURE SCI	486
J CONSUM RES	481
J ENVIRON PSYCHOL	479
J APPL PSYCHOL	455
TOUR ANAL	445
JOURNAL OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM	423
J MARKETING	403
AM PSYCHOL	383
J ACAD MARKET SCI	348
SCAND J HOSP TOUR	341
INT J ENV RES PUB HE	332
TOURISM ECON	318
LEISURE STUD	305
FRONT PSYCHOL	304
J RETAIL CONSUM SERV	298
TOUR PLAN DEV	285
APPL RES QUAL LIFE	277
ANATOLIA	276
TOUR HOSP RES	271
ANNU REV PSYCHOL	267
SERV JND J	253

295 **Bradford's Law**

296 **Description**

- 297 • **Zonal Distribution:** According to Bradford's Law, the journals are divided into three zones:
 - 298 – **Zone 1 (Core):** Ranks 1–6, where each journal has the highest frequency of articles.
 - 299 – **Zone 2:** Ranks 7–19, which collectively contribute the next significant portion of articles.
 - 300 – **Zone 3:** Ranks 20–92, comprising the largest set of journals but each contributing fewer articles
303 individually.

304 • **Zone 1 Journals (Ranks 1–6)**

- 305 1. Tourism Management (108 articles)
- 306 2. Journal of Travel Research (97)
- 307 3. Journal of Sustainable Tourism (96)
- 308 4. Current Issues in Tourism (90)
- 309 5. Annals of Tourism Research (73)
- 310 6. International Journal of Tourism Research (69)

316 Together, they have a **cumulative frequency** of **533** articles. This comparatively small group ac-
317 counts for a large share of the total documents, reflecting their high impact and centrality in the field.

318 • **Zone 2 Journals (Ranks 7–19)**

- 319 – Includes journals such as *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* (55 articles),
320 *Tourism Management Perspectives* (51), and *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* (49).
- 322 – Their cumulative frequency extends from **588** up to **1043**, indicating they collectively represent
323 another substantial fraction of the total publications.

324 • **Zone 3 Journals (Ranks 20–92)**

- 325 – Contains the majority of the listed journals (from *Journal of Vacation Marketing* at rank 20 to
326 *Sport Business and Management* at rank 92).
- 328 – Each source contributes fewer articles, but in aggregate they form the largest zone, reflecting
329 the breadth and diversity of niche or emerging outlets in tourism and hospitality research.

330 **Interpretation**

331 1. **Clear Core Group:**

332 Zone 1 journals (the top six) are widely recognized as **key outlets** in tourism research. Their high
333 article frequencies signify their **central role** in disseminating foundational and cutting-edge studies.

334 2. **Secondary But Still Significant Contributors:**

335 Zone 2 journals each have notable publication counts, reinforcing their status as important, although
336 slightly less central, **publication avenues**. They often cater to particular subfields or combine tourism
337 with other related disciplines (e.g., hospitality, recreation, or destination management).

338 3. **Long Tail in Zone 3:**


339 The largest cluster includes many specialized or regional journals. While each has fewer publications,
340 collectively they offer **diverse perspectives and niche contributions** to the field. This distribution
341 aligns with Bradford's Law, showing how research output is concentrated in a small number of core
342 sources, with a wide array of additional journals making smaller but collectively significant contribu-
343 tions.

344 **Conclusion & Summary**

345 By applying Bradford's Law, we see a **high concentration of articles in a small group of journals** (Zone
346 1), followed by a moderately sized set (Zone 2), and a broad "long tail" (Zone 3).

347 **In summary**, the data confirm that a **few core journals** (Tourism Management, Journal of Travel Research,
348 Journal of Sustainable Tourism, etc.) dominate the field, while many other journals contribute essential but
349 more specialized insights. This distribution reflects a **mature academic domain** in which recognized flag-
350 ship journals coexist alongside numerous specialized outlets, together shaping the multi-faceted landscape
351 of tourism and hospitality scholarship.

SO	Rank	Freq	Report	Freq	Zo
TOURISM MANAGEMENT	1	108		108	Zo
JOURNAL OF TRAVEL RESEARCH	2	97		205	Zo
JOURNAL OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM	3	96		301	Zo
CURRENT ISSUES IN TOURISM	4	90		391	Zo
ANNALS OF TOURISM RESEARCH	5	73		464	Zo
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TOURISM RESEARCH	6	69		533	Zo
JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM MANAGEMENT	7	55		588	Zo
TOURISM MANAGEMENT PERSPECTIVES	8	51		639	Zo
ASIA PACIFIC JOURNAL OF TOURISM RESEARCH	9	49		688	Zo
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT	10	46		734	Zo
JOURNAL OF DESTINATION MARKETING & MANAGEMENT	11	42		776	Zo
JOURNAL OF TRAVEL & TOURISM MARKETING	12	41		817	Zo
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT	13	40		857	Zo
TOURISM REVIEW	14	37		894	Zo
JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY & TOURISM RESEARCH	15	33		927	Zo
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TOURISM CITIES	16	30		957	Zo
TOURISM RECREATION RESEARCH	17	30		987	Zo
WORLDWIDE HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM THEMES	18	29		1016	Zo
JOURNAL OF OUTDOOR RECREATION AND TOURISM-RESEARCH PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT	19	27		1043	Zo
JOURNAL OF VACATION MARKETING	20	25		1068	Zo
JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM INSIGHTS	21	24		1092	Zo
ANATOLIA-INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY RESEARCH	22	23		1115	Zo
TOURISM GEOGRAPHIES	23	23		1138	Zo
JOURNAL OF TOURISM AND CULTURAL CHANGE	24	21		1159	Zo
TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY RESEARCH	25	20		1179	Zo
TOURISM ECONOMICS	26	18		1197	Zo
TOURISM PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT	27	17		1214	Zo
JOURNAL OF TOURISM FUTURES	28	16		1230	Zo
LEISURE SCIENCES	29	16		1246	Zo
TOURISM ANALYSIS	30	16		1262	Zo
EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF TOURISM RESEARCH	31	15		1277	Zo
JOURNAL OF QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HOSPITALITY & TOURISM	32	15		1292	Zo
JOURNAL OF TOURISM SUSTAINABILITY AND WELL-BEING	33	15		1307	Zo
LEISURE STUDIES	34	15		1322	Zo
EVENT MANAGEMENT	35	12		1334	Zo
JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY MARKETING & MANAGEMENT	36	12		1346	Zo
SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM	37	12	BIBLIOMETRICS	1358	Zo



353 Sources' Local Impact

354 Description

355 1. High-impact Leaders

- **Tourism Management** (h -index = 54) stands out with the highest h -index, followed by **Annals of Tourism Research** (40) and **Journal of Travel Research** (40).
- The g -index values follow a similar pattern, with **Tourism Management** (g = 98), **Annals of Tourism Research** (73), and **Journal of Travel Research** (74) at the forefront.

361 2. Total Citations (TC) and Number of Publications (NP)

- **Tourism Management** again tops the list with **9,706 total citations** across **108 publications**, reflecting both **volume** and **influence**.
- **Annals of Tourism Research** (TC = 6,712; NP = 73) and **Journal of Travel Research** (TC = 5,595; NP = 97) also show high visibility and citation impact.

367 3. m-index (Years Normalized)

- 368 • **Tourism Management** and **Journal of Travel Research** share a high m-index of **2.35**,
369 indicating that even when controlling for how long they've been publishing in this dataset
370 (PY_start), they maintain strong citation momentum year over year.
371
372 • **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** ($m = 1.89$) also exhibits a robust rate of accumulating citations
373 since 2008.

374 **4. Emerging or Specialized Journals**

- 375 • Many journals further down the list have lower h-index and g-index scores (e.g., h-index < 10).
376 Some have relatively high m-index values despite lower absolute citation counts, indicating
377 **rapid growth** within fewer years of publication history (e.g., *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism
Management*, $h=18$, $m=1.8$, started in 2016).

379 **Interpretation**

380 • **Core Influence of Established Titles:**

381 The highest h-index and g-index values cluster around **long-standing, flagship tourism journals**,
382 confirming their role as **core venues** where influential and widely cited research is published.

383 • **Role of Publication Timeline:**

384 The **m-index** (which normalizes the h-index by publication years) reveals that **newer outlets** can still
385 accumulate citations rapidly if they publish high-impact studies. For example, *Tourism Management
Perspectives* ($m = 2.09$, started in 2015) has gained traction quickly, suggesting it's an emerging
386 high-impact venue.

388 • **Breadth of Field Maturity:**

389 Journals with moderate or low h-index/g-index but strong niche focus (e.g., *Information Technology
& Tourism*) indicate the **specialized sub-areas** within tourism scholarship. They may have fewer
390 articles overall but still contribute valuable, specialized insights.

392 • **Influence of Journal Age:**

393 Some older journals (e.g., *Annals of Tourism Research*, started 1992) have large total citation counts
394 thanks to **decades-long** scholarship. In contrast, newly launched or recently included journals may
395 show lower overall metrics simply due to **less citation-accumulation time**.

396 **Conclusion & Summary**


397 The data reinforce the **dominant local impact** of long-established tourism journals, particularly **Tourism
Management**, **Annals of Tourism Research**, and **Journal of Travel Research**. They feature the highest
398 h-index and citation counts, underscoring their **central role** in advancing tourism scholarship. Meanwhile,
399 newer or more specialized journals can still exhibit a strong **m-index**, reflecting **rapid citation growth** in
400 emerging areas.

402 **In summary**, the local impact indicators (h-index, g-index, m-index, total citations) demonstrate a **well-
defined hierarchy** of core tourism journals while highlighting the potential for newer outlets to build influ-
404 ence quickly through highly cited research.

Source	h_index	g_index	RI Report	Index
				m_index
TOURISM MANAGEMENT	54	98	2.34782	
ANNALS OF TOURISM RESEARCH	40	73	1.17647	
JOURNAL OF TRAVEL RESEARCH	40	74	2.35294	
JOURNAL OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM	34	55	1.88888	
CURRENT ISSUES IN TOURISM	24	43	1.41176	
TOURISM MANAGEMENT PERSPECTIVES	23	44	2.09090	
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT	22	37	1.57142	
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TOURISM RESEARCH	22	41	1.22222	
JOURNAL OF TRAVEL & TOURISM MARKETING	22	40	1.29411	
JOURNAL OF DESTINATION MARKETING & MANAGEMENT	20	33	1.53846	
ASIA PACIFIC JOURNAL OF TOURISM RESEARCH	18	28	1.12500	
JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM MANAGEMENT	18	33	1.80000	
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT	17	30	1.21428	
JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY & TOURISM RESEARCH	15	29	1.25000	
TOURISM REVIEW	15	27	1.87500	
JOURNAL OF OUTDOOR RECREATION AND TOURISM-RESEARCH PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT	12	18	1.50000	
JOURNAL OF VACATION MARKETING	12	21	1.33333	
TOURISM GEOGRAPHIES	12	23	0.66666	
SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM	10	12	0.66666	
TOURISM ECONOMICS	10	18	0.55555	
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TOURISM CITIES	9	14	1.50000	
JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM INSIGHTS	9	13	1.50000	
JOURNAL OF TOURISM AND CULTURAL CHANGE	9	13	0.69230	
LEISURE STUDIES	9	15	0.56250	
JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY MARKETING & MANAGEMENT	8	12	0.72727	
LEISURE SCIENCES	8	12	0.33333	
ANATOLIA-INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY RESEARCH	7	11	1.16666	
EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF TOURISM RESEARCH	7	11	1.16666	
JOURNAL OF TOURISM FUTURES	7	11	1.16666	
TOURISM RECREATION RESEARCH	7	12	2.33333	
TOURIST STUDIES	7	12	0.53846	
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY & TOURISM	6	7	0.85714	
JOURNAL OF LEISURE RESEARCH	6	7	0.27272	
TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY RESEARCH	6	8	1.20000	
TOURISM PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT	6	10	1.00000	
EUROPEAN SPORT MANAGEMENT QUARTERLY	5	5	0.35714	
EVENT MANAGEMENT	5	5	0.83333	

Sources

TOURISM MANAGEMENT
 ANNALS OF TOURISM RESEARCH
 JOURNAL OF TRAVEL RESEARCH
 JOURNAL OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM
 CURRENT ISSUES IN TOURISM
 TOURISM MANAGEMENT PERSPECTIVES
 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT
 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TOURISM RESEARCH
 JOURNAL OF TRAVEL & TOURISM MARKETING
 JOURNAL OF DESTINATION MARKETING & MANAGEMENT
 ASIA PACIFIC JOURNAL OF TOURISM RESEARCH
 JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM MANAGEMENT
 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT
 JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY & TOURISM RESEARCH
 TOURISM REVIEW
 JOURNAL OF OUTDOOR RECREATION AND TOURISM-RESEARCH PLANNING AND MANAGE
 JOURNAL OF VACATION MARKETING
 TOURISM GEOGRAPHIES
 SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM
 TOURISM ECONOMICS
 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TOURISM CITIES
 JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM INSIGHTS
 JOURNAL OF TOURISM AND CULTURAL CHANGE
 LEISURE STUDIES
 JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY MARKETING & MANAGEMENT
 LEISURE SCIENCES
 ANATOLIA-INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY RESEARCH
 EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF TOURISM RESEARCH
 JOURNAL OF TOURISM FUTURES
 TOURISM RECREATION RESEARCH



405

406 Sources' Production over Time

407 Description

408 The table shows the yearly publication counts from 1992 to 2025 for ten leading journals in tourism and
 409 hospitality:

- 410 1. **Tourism Management**
- 411
- 412 2. **Journal of Travel Research**
- 413
- 414 3. **Journal of Sustainable Tourism**
- 415
- 416 4. **Current Issues in Tourism**
- 417
- 418 5. **Annals of Tourism Research**
- 419
- 420 6. **International Journal of Tourism Research**

422 **7. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management**

423
424 **8. Tourism Management Perspectives**

425
426 **9. Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research**

427
428 **10. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management**

429 **Early Years (1992–2002)**

- 430 • **Annals of Tourism Research** dominates the early phase, appearing as early as 1992 with 1 publication, incrementally increasing to 4 publications by 2001.
- 433 • Other journals show **zero** publications during this period (e.g., *Tourism Management*, *Journal of Travel Research*).

435 **Mid-Years (2003–2010)**

- 436 • **Tourism Management** starts contributing in 2003 with 1 publication, growing to 9 publications by 2010.
- 439 • **Annals of Tourism Research** remains strong, going from 5 (2003) to 12 (2010).
- 441 • **Journal of Travel Research** emerges around 2009 with 2 publications, rising to 4 by 2010.
- 443 • **International Journal of Tourism Research** begins in 2008 with 1 article and reaches 4 by 2010.

444 **Growth Phase (2011–2015)**

- 445 • **Tourism Management** and **Annals of Tourism Research** steadily increase. For example, *Tourism Management* rises from 9 (2011) to 22 (2015).
- 448 • **Journal of Travel Research** climbs from 9 (2011) to 20 (2015).
- 450 • **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** picks up pace, moving from 1 in 2010 to 14 in 2015.
- 452 • **Current Issues in Tourism** also starts to gain momentum, reaching 8 by 2015.

453 **Acceleration Period (2016–2020)**

- 454 • **Tourism Management** demonstrates a notable surge, growing from 33 (2016) to 70 (2020).
- 456 • **Journal of Travel Research** expands from 28 (2016) to 45 (2020).
- 458 • **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** grows quickly, from 18 (2016) to 43 (2020).

- 460 • **Tourism Management Perspectives** (introduced in 2015) exhibits rapid early expansion, reaching
461 18 publications by 2020.
- 462
- 463 • **International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management** increases from 3 (2016) to 22
464 (2020).

465 **Recent Years (2021–2025)**

- 466 • Continued upward trend across all journals, with **Tourism Management** reaching 108 by 2025.
- 467
- 468 • **Journal of Travel Research** hits 97, **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** 96, and **Current Issues in**
469 **Tourism** 90 by 2025.
- 470
- 471 • **Annals of Tourism Research** stabilizes at 73 from 2024 to 2025, suggesting a plateau in this dataset.
- 472
- 473 • **International Journal of Tourism Research** hits 69, **Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Man-**
474 **agement** 55, and **Tourism Management Perspectives** 51 by 2025, all indicating robust yet slightly
475 lower counts than the top three.

476 **Interpretation**

477 1. **Dominance Shift Over Time**

- 478 • While **Annals of Tourism Research** was the earliest mover, **Tourism Management** eventually
479 overtakes it in volume. Similarly, **Journal of Travel Research** shows later but sustained growth,
480 indicating a dynamic shift of publication leadership.

481 2. **Rise of Sustainability and Specialized Focus**

- 482 • **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** experiences a substantial lift after the mid-2000s. This may
483 reflect the growing global emphasis on **sustainable practices** and research funding or academic
484 interest in this subfield.

485 3. **Emergence of New Titles**


- 486 • **Tourism Management Perspectives** launched around 2015 and grows quickly, suggesting a
487 **demand for alternative outlets** or specific focus areas within tourism management.
- 488
- 489 • **Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research** also gains traction steadily from the 2010s onward,
490 highlighting the **regional** research expansion in tourism.

491 4. **Overall Increasing Trend**

- 492 • Nearly all titles show an **upward trend** in publication counts, which underscores the **rapid**
493 **expansion** of tourism and hospitality research overall.
- 494
- 495 • The convergence of counts by 2025 reveals **multiple well-established journals** in this domain
496 rather than one or two dominating. This diversification indicates a maturing field with **varied**
497 **themes and focal areas**.

498 Conclusion & Summary

499 In summary, the data reflect the **evolution of tourism and hospitality scholarship** over three decades.
500 Early on, **Annals of Tourism Research** led the field; however, **Tourism Management** and **Journal of**
501 **Travel Research** later rose to the forefront, indicating shifts in scholarly emphasis. The emergence and
502 rapid rise of specialized journals (e.g., **Journal of Sustainable Tourism**, **Tourism Management Per-**
503 **spectives**) align with evolving research interests (sustainability, specialized management approaches). Ul-
504 timately, the growing publication counts suggest a **highly active and continually diversifying** research
505 landscape.



506

Year	TOURISM.MANAGEMENT	JOURNAL.OF.TRAVEL.RESEARCH	JOURNAL.OF.SUSTAINABLE.TOURISM
1992	0		0
1993	0		0
1994	0		0
1995	0		0
1996	0		0
1997	0		0
1998	0		0
1999	0		0
2000	0		0
2001	0		0
2002	0		0
2003	1		0
2004	1		0
2005	1		0
2006	4		0
2007	5		0
2008	6		0
2009	8		2
2010	9		4
2011	9		9
2012	11		12
2013	13		17
2014	19		18
2015	22		20
2016	33		28
2017	47		34
2018	56		36
2019	61		44
2020	70		45
2021	78		57
2022	88		67
2023	93		78
2024	99		91
2025	108		97

507 **Authors**

508 **Authors**

509 **Most Relevant Authors**

510 **Description**

511 • **High-Volume Authors**

- 512 – The list is headed by **UYSAL M** with **27** articles (fractional count: 8.75), followed by **FILEP S** (22 articles, 6.64 fractional) and **KIM S** (20 articles, 6.73 fractional).
513
514 – These top contributors each have upwards of **15** total articles, indicating a **select group** who
516 have published extensively in the field.

517 • **Fractionalized Authorship**

- 518 – Fractional counts (e.g., 8.75 for 27 articles, 6.64 for 22 articles) reflect **shared authorship** roles.
519
520 – Large differences between total articles and fractional counts (e.g., 27 vs. 8.75 for UYSAL M)
521 suggest **collaborations** with multiple co-authors.
522
523 – Authors with similar total articles may show varying fractional counts, indicating **differences**
524 **in their level of contribution** across each collaboration.

525 • **Long Tail of Contributors**

- 526 – After the top 10–15 names, there are many authors with **fewer total articles** (often under 10).
527
528 – This highlights a **broad, dispersed community** of researchers contributing occasional or spe-
529 cialized studies.

530 • **Multiple Authors Named “KIM,” “LEE,” “WANG,” “CHEN,” “ZHANG,” etc.**

- 531 – Common surnames among East Asian authors appear frequently, underscoring the **global and**
532 **particularly Asian** involvement in tourism/hospitality research.
533
534 – Careful distinction is made via initials (e.g., KIM S, KIM H, KIM J) or fractional counts.

535 **Interpretation**

536 1. **Core Group of Influential Scholars**

- 537 • Authors like **UYSAL M**, **FILEP S**, and **KIM S** have built **substantial publication portfolios**,
538 indicating they may be **leading voices or prolific senior researchers** in tourism and hospitality
539 scholarship.

540 2. **Significance of Collaborative Research**

- 541 • The gap between total articles and fractional authorship suggests **widespread co-authoring**.
542 Researchers are forming teams to tackle complex topics, share expertise, and leverage cross-
543 institutional resources.

544 **3. Globalization and Diversity**

- 545 • The presence of a **vast array of names** from varied linguistic backgrounds signals a **global re-**
546 **search network**. Collaboration extends across continents, reflecting the **international nature**
547 of tourism and hospitality studies.

548 **4. Potential Niche or Emergent Scholars**


- 549 • The numerous authors with **1 or 2** articles might be:
550 – **Early-career academics** entering the field,
551 – **Practitioners** co-authoring in specialized areas, or
552 – **Occasional contributors** from adjacent disciplines (e.g., psychology, marketing, sustain-
553 ability).

554 **Conclusion & Summary**

555 In summary, a **small group** of highly prolific authors stands out, evidenced by both **total** and **fraction-**
556 **alized** article counts. The **extensive collaborations** indicated by fractional authorship counts reflect the
557 **team-based, interdisciplinary** nature of tourism research. Meanwhile, the **long tail** of smaller contribu-
558 tors underscores the field's **broad appeal** and **global reach**.

559 **Overall**, the data reveal a dynamic scholarly community with a few leading figures and many emergent or
560 specialized voices, collectively shaping the ongoing development of tourism and hospitality research.

Authors	Articles	Articles.Fractionalized
UYSAL M	27	8.750000
FILEP S	22	6.642857
KIM S	20	6.733333
SU LJ	18	5.866667
NAWIJN J	15	6.700000
ZHANG Y	15	5.616667
KIM H	14	3.716667
GAO J	13	4.116667
LEE CK	13	4.066667
LEE TJ	13	4.250000
STHAPIT E	13	4.366667
WANG YC	13	3.950000
CROES R	12	4.700000
HAN H	12	3.166667
SIRGY MJ	12	4.900000
CHEN CC	11	3.816667
PRAYAG G	10	3.500000
RAMKISsoon H	10	3.650000
VADA S	10	2.109524
BERBEKOVA A	9	2.783333
CHEN Y	9	3.000000
FU XX	9	3.583333
RASOOLIMANESH SM	9	3.000000
RIDDERSTAAT J	9	3.000000
WU MY	9	3.233333
XIAO HG	9	3.250000
KIM J	8	2.533333
MITAS O	8	2.477778
PETRICK JF	8	3.083333
WOOSNAM KM	8	2.450000
ALRAWADIEH Z	7	2.116667
BIMONTE S	7	3.750000
GURSOY D	7	1.983333
HUANG SS	7	2.700000
JORDAN EJ	7	2.375000
LAW R	7	1.733333
LI J	7	2.000000
LIANG ZX	7	2.833333
MACKENZIE SH	7	2.533333
MORGAN N	7	2.116667
PINTO P	7	1.741667
WONG IA	7	1.733333
ALTINAY L	6	1.666667
BJÖRK P	6	2.250000
BOLEY BB	6	1.676190 ²⁸
EUSÉBIO C	6	1.550000
FYALL A	6	1.533333
JAAFAAR M	6	1.833333



563

564 Most Local Cited Authors

565 The provided bibliometric analysis focuses on “most local citations” related to the field. “Local citations”
 566 typically refer to the number of times an author’s work is cited by other works within a specific dataset or
 567 field of study.

568 Description

- 569 • Top Local Citations

- 570 – UYSAL M leads with 1049 local citations, significantly ahead of all other authors.
- 571
- 572 – SIRGY MJ (830) and KIM H (654) also show notably high citation counts.
- 573
- 574 – Others with 500+ citations include WOO E (536) and NAWIJN J (385).

- 575 • Broad Range of Citation Counts

- 576 – After the top tier (500+ citations), a long list of authors have citations ranging from a few
 577 hundred to single digits.
- 578
- 579 – The dataset extends down to authors with 1 or 2 local citations, indicating a wide citation
 580 distribution across many contributors.

581 • Evidence of Numerous Contributors

- 582 – Hundreds of authors appear, reflecting **broad, collaborative research** in the field.
- 583
- 584 – Many authors beyond the top 10–20 still maintain respectable citation counts (e.g., 50–200),
- 585 underscoring a **robust middle tier**.

586 **Interpretation**

587 1. Influential Scholars

- 588 • High local citations (500+) often align with **well-established researchers** who have published
- 589 extensively on seminal or in-demand topics (e.g., tourism impact, quality of life, hospitality
- 590 management).
- 591
- 592 • **UYSAL M** and **SIRGY MJ** are prime examples of researchers whose foundational theories or
- 593 frameworks likely generate ongoing citations.

594 2. Academic Focus and Collaboration

- 595 • The number of authors listed indicates a **wide-reaching, collaborative field**.
- 596
- 597 • Authors in the 100–300 citation range often engage in **multiple co-authored projects** across
- 598 sub-disciplines (e.g., destination marketing, sustainable tourism). Their citation impact suggests
- 599 **relevance and consistent publication** but perhaps with more specialized or emergent topics.

600 3. Long Tail of New or Specialized Contributors

- 601 • Many authors with fewer citations could be **early-career academics, occasional contributors**,
- 602 or scholars from related disciplines publishing in tourism/hospitality.
- 603
- 604 • This “long tail” phenomenon is **typical of a mature field**, where a few authors lead in citations,
- 605 but **many** still contribute in niche areas or collaborative projects.

606 **Conclusion & Summary**

607 Overall, **local citation counts** reveal a **core group of highly influential authors** (e.g., Uysal, Sirgy, Kim)

608 shaping major discussions in tourism and hospitality research. A **substantial middle tier** indicates a healthy


609 ecosystem of established scholars, while the **long tail** underscores ongoing influx of new or specialized

610 voices.

611 **In summary**, the breadth of authors and their varying citation levels signal a **diverse and dynamic research**

612 **community**, with a few standout leaders consistently driving the field’s academic conversations.

Author	LocalCitations
UYSAL M	1049
SIRGY MJ	830
KIM H	654
WOO E	536
NAWIJN J	385
MCCABE S	260
FILEP S	249
CHEN CC	218
CROES R	210
PETRICK JF	201
KIM K	197
ANDERECK KL	189
NYAUPANE GP	183
SU LJ	183
CHEN Y	179
JOHNSON S	171
YU GB	157
LEE DJ	154
MITAS O	153
ABDULLAH J	146
GILBERT D	146
DIEKMANN A	138
GURSOY D	138
SMITH MK	138
SHARPLEY R	130
KRUGER PS	126
RIDDERSTAAT J	118
DOLNICAR S	116
CLIFF K	109
YANAMANDRAM V	109
VADA S	108
LEHTO XY	107
LEE CK	106
RASOOLIMANESH SM	104
HARTWELL H	103
HEMINGWAY A	103



613

614 Authors' Production over Time

615 This bibliometric analysis reflects the scholarly publications on the topic by various authors over the years.
 616 Let's elaborate on the results, particularly focusing on the "authors' production over time":

617 Description

618 1. Core Research Themes

- 619 • The recurring focus is on **well-being**, **quality of life (QOL)**, **mental health**, **residents' attitudes**, and **community development** in tourism contexts.
- 621
- 622 • Many articles connect **destination competitiveness**, **tourism experience**, and **sustainability** to **subjective well-being**, underscoring how travelers' and residents' lives are impacted by tourism.
- 623
- 624

625 2. Temporal and Topical Evolution

- 626 • **Earlier Publications** (2010–2013) emphasize foundational ideas:
 - 627 – The concept of **holiday happiness curves**
 - 628
 - 629 – Measuring **tourists' changing emotions** over trip durations
- 630

- 631 – Links between **leisure travel** and **life satisfaction**
- 632
- 633 • **Mid-Period (2014–2017):**
- 634 – A surge in **co-creation** and **community-based** tourism research
- 635
- 636 – Greater interest in **nature-based** or **heritage** tourism and their influences on **well-being**
- 637
- 638 – Emergence of **casinos/gaming** and **festival events** to study impacts on host communities'
- 639 QOL
- 640 • **Recent Years (2018–2025):**
- 641 – Focused on **digital/virtual experiences**, **metaverse** or **VR tourism**, and **live streaming**
- 642
- 643 – **Mental health** and **employee well-being** in hospitality contexts
- 644
- 645 – **Diaspora festivals**, **transnational religious tourism**, and **interdisciplinary** approaches
- 646 to QOL measurement

647 3. High Citation vs. New Publications

- 648 • Older, seminal articles (e.g., 2015–2016) often have very high total citations and a notable
- 649 **citations per year (TCpY)**.
- 650
- 651 • Many **2024–2025** publications show **low or zero** total citations due to their **recent release**,
- 652 though some indicate promising themes (e.g., mental health, VR tourism) that align with emerging
- 653 industry and societal trends.

654 4. Key Authors and Contribution

- 655 • **UYSAL M** appears extensively, highlighting a strong research focus on **quality of life**,
656 **well-being** metrics, and **destination performance**.
- 657
- 658 • **FILEP S** consistently explores **tourist well-being** from a **positive psychology** perspective,
659 including **hedonic/eudaimonic** frameworks.
- 660
- 661 • **KIM S**, **KIM H**, **SU LJ**, and others analyze **resident-tourist interactions**, **festival experiences**, and **community empowerment**.
- 662
- 663 • **Rasoolimanesh SM**, **Ramkissoon H**, **Prayag G**, **Croes R**, etc., focus on **sustainable tourism**
664 and **destination management** through **quality-of-life** lenses.
- 665

666 Interpretation

667 1. Growing Importance of Well-Being Paradigms

- 668 • The repeated emphasis on **quality of life** and **subjective well-being** indicates a paradigm shift:
669 tourism success is no longer measured solely by **economic gains**, but also by **social**, **psychological**, and **environmental** dimensions.
- 670

671 **2. Interdisciplinary and Global Collaboration**

- 672 • Many articles integrate frameworks from **psychology** (e.g., PERMA model), **sociology**
673 (solidarity, empowerment), and **business/marketing** (value co-creation), showcasing cross-
674 disciplinary research designs.
- 675
- 676 • Topics like **virtual reality** or **metaverse tourism** reveal expansions into **technological** and
677 **digital** aspects of tourism experiences.

678 **3. Attention to Diverse Stakeholders**

- 679 • Authors increasingly examine **residents' attitudes**, **empowerment**, and **social responsibility**—indicating that the **host community** perspective is central to sustainable tourism.
- 680
- 681 • There is also attention to **employees' mental health** and **hospitality workplace** well-being,
682 reflecting a holistic industry approach.

684 **4. Continued Innovation**


- 685 • Most recent publications (2023–2025) delve into **new theories** (e.g., diaspora and spiritual
686 festivals, pet-accompanying tourism, K-pop music tourism, AI usage) to clarify how tourism
687 fosters or hampers **well-being** across contexts.
- 688
- 689 • These directions suggest an **ongoing evolution** of tourism scholarship toward more **nuanced**,
690 **human-centric** frameworks.

691 **Conclusion & Summary**

692 Overall, the dataset underscores a **dynamic and continually diversifying** field of tourism research, with
693 **well-being** and **quality of life** emerging as central metrics of both **traveler** and **resident** outcomes. The
694 **broad range** of authors, years, and interdisciplinary theories reveal how tourism and hospitality scholarship
695 is **expanding** to include **technological**, **social**, and **psychological** determinants of success.

696 In **summary**, the collective publications illustrate a **mature research landscape** increasingly focused on
697 **sustainability**, **mental health**, and **community well-being**—a vital shift from purely economic perspectives
698 to **holistic measures** of tourism's impact.

Author	year	TI
UYSAL M	2025	INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH TO TOURISM DEMAND MODELING:
UYSAL M	2025	QUALITY-OF-LIFE: A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF RESEARCH PROGR
UYSAL M	2025	QUALITY OF LIFE PERFORMANCE INDEX FOR TOURISM DESTINATIO
UYSAL M	2024	TOURISM DEVELOPMENT AS A MODERATOR BETWEEN EMOTION AN
UYSAL M	2024	QUALITY OF LIFE AND PUBLIC POLICY DEVELOPMENT FOR TOURIS
UYSAL M	2024	SMART TOURISM DESTINATION (STD): DEVELOPING AND VALIDATI
UYSAL M	2022	TOWARD AN ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY OF LIFE INDICATORS AS ME
UYSAL M	2022	PURSUING JUSTICE AND QUALITY OF LIFE: SUPPORTING TOURISM
UYSAL M	2022	GLADIIS ET CLYPEIS: TRAVEL MOTIVES TOWARDS AN IMPROVEMEN
UYSAL M	2022	GASTRO-TOURISM WELL-BEING: THE INTERPLAYS OF SALIENT AND
UYSAL M	2021	IS THIS ABOUT FEELING? THE INTERPLAY OF EMOTIONAL WELL-BE
UYSAL M	2021	ENHANCING THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF SENIOR TOURISTS: A THEOR
UYSAL M	2020	DESIGNING FOR QUALITY OF LIFE
UYSAL M	2020	MEASURING TOURISM SUCCESS - ALTERNATIVE OUTCOME VARIAB
UYSAL M	2020	IS QOL A BETTER PREDICTOR OF SUPPORT FOR FESTIVAL DEVELOPM
UYSAL M	2019	QUALITY-OF-LIFE INDICATORS AS PERFORMANCE MEASURES
UYSAL M	2018	SOCIAL INVOLVEMENT AND PARK CITIZENSHIP AS MODERATORS FO
UYSAL M	2018	TOURIST SATISFACTION AND SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING: AN INDEX A
UYSAL M	2018	TOURISM IMPACT AND STAKEHOLDERS' QUALITY OF LIFE
UYSAL M	2016	QUALITY OF LIFE (QOL) AND WELL-BEING RESEARCH IN TOURISM
UYSAL M	2016	THE EFFECT OF CO-CREATION EXPERIENCE ON OUTCOME VARIABLE
UYSAL M	2016	IMPACTS OF FESTIVALS AND EVENTS ON RESIDENTS' WELL-BEING
UYSAL M	2015	TOURISM EXPERIENCE AND QUALITY OF LIFE AMONG ELDERLY TO
UYSAL M	2015	NATURE-BASED TOURISM: MOTIVATION AND SUBJECTIVE WELL-BE
UYSAL M	2015	LIFE SATISFACTION AND SUPPORT FOR TOURISM DEVELOPMENT
UYSAL M	2014	VALIDATING A CUSTOMER WELL-BEING INDEX RELATED TO NATUR
UYSAL M	2013	HOW DOES TOURISM IN A COMMUNITY IMPACT THE QUALITY OF LI
FILEP S	2024	RE-THINKING TOURIST WELLBEING: AN INTEGRATIVE MODEL OF A
FILEP S	2024	VIRTUAL TOURISM EXPERIENCES AND MENTAL RESTORATION
FILEP S	2024	TOURIST WELLBEING: RE-THINKING HEDONIC AND EUDAIMONIC D
FILEP S	2024	THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY IN USERS' WELLBEING: CONCEPTUALI
FILEP S	2024	EXPLORING CHINESE TOURISTS' WELL-BEING THROUGH A CONFUC
FILEP S	2024	WEBCAM TRAVEL: A PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION OF PSYCHOLOGI
FILEP S	2024	EXPLORING THE PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING OF TOURISM COMM
FILEP S	2024	POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGY INTERVENTIONS FOR HOSPITALITY MANAG
FILEP S	2023	JOURNALING MEMORABLE AND MEANINGFUL TOURISM EXPERIENC
FILEP S	2023	WELCOME BACK: REPEAT VISITATION AND TOURIST WELLBEING
FILEP S	2023	INTRODUCTION OF GENEROSITY INTO COMMERCIAL HOSPITALITY:
FILEP S	2023	HOW DOES ADVENTURE SPORT TOURISM ENHANCE WELL-BEING? A
FILEP S	2022	DIMENSIONS OF FRIENDSHIP IN SHARED TRAVEL EXPERIENCES
FILEP S	2022	EXPERIENCES OF LOVE IN DIASPORA TOURISM
FILEP S	2022	PROGRESS IN RESEARCH ON SENIORS' WELL-BEING IN TOURISM: A
FILEP S	2022	THE INFLUENCE OF TRAVEL COMPANIONSHIPS ON MEMORABLE TO
FILEP S	2021	EXPLORING WELL-BEING OUTCOMES AT AN ICONIC CHINESE LGBT
FILEP S	2020	SHAPING TOURISTS' WELLBEING THROUGH GUIDED SLOW ADVENT
FILEP S	2019	TRENDS AND DIRECTIONS IN TOURISM AND POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGY
FILEP S	2017	TOURISM AND GRATITUDE: VALUING ACTS OF KINDNESS
FILEP S	2014	MOVING BEYOND SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING A TOURISM CRITIQUE



699

700 **Lotka's Law**

701 Lotka's Law is a fundamental principle in bibliometrics and scientometrics, which are fields concerned with
 702 the quantitative study of scientific and technological literature. Named after Alfred J. Lotka, who proposed
 703 the idea in 1926, this law describes the frequency with which authors publish in a particular field.

704 **Lotka's Law** can be represented mathematically as:

$$Y = \frac{C}{X^\alpha}$$

- 705 • Where:
- 706 – \$ Y \$ is the number of authors making \$ X \$ contributions
 - 707 – \$ C \$ is a constant (it describes the number of authors making only one contribution)
 - 708 – \$ \alpha \$ is a constant usually close to 2 (though it can vary depending on the discipline).
- 709 • Interpretation of Lotka's Law:
- 710 1. **Majority Publishes Once:** A large number of authors will have only one publication, which
 711 corresponds to the value of \$ C \$.

712 2. **Decrease in Frequency:** As the number of publications per author (i.e., productivity) increases,
713 the number of authors who have published that many times decreases, and this decrease is very
714 sharp (often described as an inverse square law).

715 3. **Few Prolific Authors:** Only a very small number of authors will be responsible for a large
716 portion of the publications in a particular field. This can be thought of as the “80-20” principle,
717 where a minority (often around 20%) of authors produce the majority (around 80%) of the work.

718 • Application:

- 719 – **Identify Core Authors:** By applying Lotka’s Law, organizations and researchers can identify
720 the core authors or the most prolific contributors in a particular field or topic.
- 721 – **Analysis of Scientific Output:** Lotka’s Law can be utilized to analyze the scientific output of
722 a field, helping in recognizing the distribution of productivity among authors.
- 723 – **Research Evaluation:** Research institutions might use this principle to evaluate the research
724 output of their faculty or departments, understanding the distribution of prolific authors versus
725 those who publish less frequently.

726 It’s worth noting that while Lotka’s Law provides a useful general observation about scientific productivity,
727 there are variations depending on the specific scientific discipline or field of study. The values of α and
728 β might differ across disciplines, and in some cases, other bibliometric models might offer a better
729 fit to the data.

730 • Measurement for the Lotka’s law is the following:

- 731 – N.Articles: This is the number of articles written by an author.
- 732 – N.Authors: This is the number of authors who have written the corresponding N.Articles.
- 733 – Freq: This is the frequency (proportion) of those authors relative to the total number of authors.

734 **Description**

735 The table shows how many authors have published N articles, alongside the **frequency** of authors for each
736 N .

737 • **Highest Frequency at N=1:**

- 738 – **2613 authors** (80.20%) have just **1** article, the largest group, indicating a “long tail” of
739 contributors.
- 740 – This high proportion of single-publication authors is typical in many scholarly fields, aligning
741 with the **inverse-square** or **inverse-power** distribution suggested by Lotka’s Law.

743 • **Gradual Decrease for Higher N:**

- 744 – As the number of articles authored (N) increases, the number of authors contributing that many
745 articles **decreases sharply**. For instance:
 - 746 * 2 articles: 377 authors (11.57%)
 - 747 * 3 articles: 106 authors (3.25%)

750 * 5 articles: 31 authors (0.95%)

751 * Very few authors produce **more than 10** articles.

752 • **Very Productive Authors:**

753 – Only **1 author** has produced **27** articles, one has **22**, and one has **20**, illustrating the pattern in
755 which a **tiny minority** of authors contributes a **large volume** of publications.

756 **Interpretation**

757 • **Classic Power-Law Behavior:**

758 The table demonstrates a **steep power-law** (or Lotka-like) distribution, where **most** authors publish
759 **just once**, while a **small subset** of highly productive authors accounts for many publications.

760 • **Field Maturity and Broad Inclusion:**

761 The large proportion of single-publication authors signals:

762 1. **Field Openness:** Many researchers (possibly from adjacent disciplines) publish occasionally
763 in this domain.

764 2. **Potential Collaboration:** Some of these single-publication authors may be graduate students
765 or co-authors with senior researchers, indicating a collaborative environment.

767 • **Identification of Core Authors:**

768 A handful of authors consistently publishing 10+ articles are likely **key influencers** or **thought leaders**
769 in the research area. Their high productivity positions them at the center of scholarly discourse.

770 **Conclusion & Summary**

771 The data conform well to **Lotka's Law**, illustrating a typical **author productivity** pattern: 1. **Most** authors
772 publish **one** article only.


773 2. A **much smaller group** demonstrates **moderate** productivity (2–5 articles).

774 3. An **extremely small cohort** of authors achieve **high** productivity (10+ articles).

775 **In summary**, these findings highlight a **highly skewed** productivity distribution common in scientific fields,
776 where a **majority of authors** contribute a single study, and a **small group** drives a significant fraction of
777 the total output.

N.Articles	N AUTHORS	Freq
1	2613	0.8020257827
2	377	0.1157151627
3	106	0.0325352977
4	69	0.0211786372
5	31	0.0095150399
6	20	0.0061387354
7	12	0.0036832413
8	4	0.0012277471
9	7	0.0021485574
10	3	0.0009208103
11	1	0.0003069368
12	3	0.0009208103
13	5	0.0015346839
14	1	0.0003069368
15	2	0.0006138735
18	1	0.0003069368
20	1	0.0003069368
22	1	0.0003069368
27	1	0.0003069368

Author Productivity through Lotka's Law



779 Authors' Local Impact

- 780 • The followings are the measurement of the local impact
- 781 – Element: Name of the author.
- 782 – h_index: h-index of the author, which represents the maximum number of articles an author has
- 783 written that have received at least the same number of citations.
- 784 – g_index: g-index of the author, a metric that takes into account the distribution of citations
- 785 received by a researcher's publications.
- 786 – m_index: Rate of acquiring h-index points. It is calculated by dividing the h-index by the
- 787 number of years since the first published paper of the author.
- 788 – TC: Total citations the author has received.
- 789 – NP: Number of publications by the author.
- 790 – PY_start: The year of the author's first publication.

791 Description**792 • High-Impact Leaders:**

- 793 – **UYDAL M** stands out with an h-index of 16 and g-index of 27 from 27 publications (TC = 3007)
- 794 since his first publication in 2013. His m-index of 1.23 indicates robust citation accumulation
- 795 per year.
- 796 – **NAWIJN J** (h = 14, g = 15, NP = 15, TC = 1219, PY_start = 2010) and **FILEP S** (h = 13, g =
- 797 22, NP = 22, TC = 582, PY_start = 2012) follow as influential authors in the dataset.

798 • Diverse Productivity and Citation Profiles:

- 799 – Some authors, like **SU LJ** (h = 13, m = 1.18) and **KIM H** (h = 10, m = 0.91), show a solid
- 800 balance between publication output and impact.
- 801 – In contrast, **LEE CK** (h = 11, m = 0.48) has a longer career starting in 2003 with 13 articles,
- 802 but a lower m-index indicates slower yearly citation accumulation.

804 • Varied Career Stages:

- 805 – The starting years (PY_start) range from as early as 2003 (e.g., LEE CK) to more recent years
- 806 such as 2020–2021 (e.g., ALRAWADIEH Z, WEN J), reflecting both long-established and
- 807 emerging voices.
- 808 – The m-index (TC/NP normalized by career length) helps compare authors across different ca-
- 809 reer spans, revealing that more recent authors can achieve high annual impact even with fewer
- 810 publications.

811 Interpretation**812 • Citation Impact vs. Publication Volume:**

- 813 – A high h-index and g-index generally point to a consistent influence of an author's work. For
- 814 instance, UYDAL M's metrics (16/27) reflect that many of his 27 articles are highly cited.

- 816 – Authors like NAWIJN J, with 15 publications and an h-index of 14, demonstrate that nearly
817 every publication has contributed to his citation profile.

818 • **Normalized Productivity (m-index):**

- 819 – The m-index gives insight into the annual impact. UYSAL M's m-index of 1.23 is particularly
820 strong considering he started in 2013, meaning he has averaged a good citation rate each year.
821
822 – Lower m-index values (e.g., LEE CK's 0.48) can be attributed to a longer career span where
823 earlier publications may have had less impact or a slower rate of citation growth.

824 • **Field Evolution and Emerging Scholars:**


- 825 – Authors with later start years (e.g., ALRAWADIEH Z, MITAS O) and relatively high m-index
826 values suggest that newer contributions are quickly gaining recognition.
827
828 – The range of indices across authors reflects the interdisciplinary and evolving nature of the field,
829 where both established researchers and newer entrants contribute to its growth.

830 **Conclusion & Summary**

831 The local impact metrics reveal a **hierarchy of influence**: - **Core leaders** like UYSAL M, NAWIJN J,
832 FILEP S, and SU LJ have achieved high citation impact relative to their output, indicating that their work
833 is both prolific and influential. - **Normalized indices (m-index)** help account for differences in career
834 duration, showing that newer authors can be very impactful on an annual basis. - Variations in metrics among
835 authors with similar publication counts (NP) underline differences in citation performance and influence.

836 **In summary**, the data show a skewed distribution where a relatively small group of authors achieves high
837 impact (reflected by high h- and g-indices and m-index values), while others have moderate performance.
838 This pattern is typical in many academic fields, indicating that a few key researchers drive the bulk of the
839 influential scholarship.

Author	h_index	g_index	m_index	TC	NP	PY_start
UYSAL M	16	27	1.2307692	3007	27	2013
NAWIJN J	14	15	0.8750000	1219	15	2010
FILEP S	13	22	0.9285714	582	22	2012
SU LJ	13	18	1.1818182	713	18	2015
LEE CK	11	13	0.4782609	609	13	2003
HAN H	10	12	1.4285714	528	12	2019
KIM H	10	14	0.9090909	1955	14	2015
KIM S	10	17	0.7692308	322	20	2013
LEE TJ	10	13	1.0000000	390	13	2016
SIRGY MJ	10	12	0.6250000	2024	12	2010
CHEN CC	9	11	0.6923077	769	11	2013
CROES R	9	12	0.6428571	661	12	2012
PRAYAG G	9	10	0.8181818	457	10	2015
CHEN Y	8	9	0.5714286	656	9	2012
RAMKISOON H	8	10	1.0000000	524	10	2018
WANG YC	8	13	1.3333333	237	13	2020
ALRAWADIEH Z	7	7	1.4000000	127	7	2021
FU XX	7	9	0.5833333	223	9	2014
GAO J	7	13	0.8750000	237	13	2018
HUANG SS	7	7	0.6363636	320	7	2015
LAW R	7	7	0.7000000	258	7	2016
LI J	7	7	1.0000000	179	7	2019
MITAS O	7	8	0.5000000	694	8	2012
RIDDERSTAAT J	7	9	0.7000000	347	9	2016
STHAPIT E	7	13	0.8750000	397	13	2018
BIMONTE S	6	7	0.4285714	217	7	2012
GURSOY D	6	7	0.3529412	527	7	2009
JAAFAR M	6	6	0.5454545	805	6	2015
JORDAN EJ	6	7	0.5454545	281	7	2015
KIM J	6	8	0.5454545	347	8	2015
MODY M	6	6	0.6666667	285	6	2017
PEARCE PL	6	6	0.4285714	346	6	2012
PETRICK JF	6	8	0.4615385	770	8	2013
QIAO GH	6	6	0.8571429	85	6	2019
RASOOLIMANESH SM	6	9	0.5454545	970	9	2015
SUESS C	6	6	0.6666667	295	6	2017
VADA S	6	10	1.0000000	219	10	2020
WU MY	6	9	0.5000000	112	9	2014
ZHANG Y	6	9	0.8571429	91	15	2019
ALTINAY L	5	6	1.0000000	93	6	2021
BERBEKOVA A	5	9	0.8333333	160	9	2020
DOGRU T	5	5	0.7142857	214	5	2019
FYALL A	5	6	0.5555556	270	6	2017
KING B	5	5	0.5000000	147	5	2016
LEHTO XY	5	6	0.2941176	428	6	2009 ⁴²
LIANG ZX	5	7	0.5000000	185	7	2016
MACKENZIE SH	5	7	0.8333333	146	7	2020
MCCABE S	5	5	0.3125000	615	5	2010



841 **Affiliations**

842 **Most Relevant Affiliations**

843 The data provided is a bibliometric analysis focusing on the affiliations that have contributed to research
844 related to psychological entitlement. Bibliometric analyses help understand the research landscape of a
845 specific topic by evaluating the academic output from various institutions. The data lists different university
846 systems and universities with the number of articles they've published on the topic.

847 **Description**

848 • **Top Affiliations by Article Count:**

- 849 – **STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA** leads with **104 articles**.
- 850 – **HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY** follows closely with **97 articles**.
- 851 – **GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY** contributes **73 articles**, while **SUN YAT SEN UNIVERSITY** and
852 **UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA** add **56** and **55 articles**, respectively.

853 • **Diverse Global Representation:**

- 854 – The list features institutions from North America (e.g., University of Central Florida, Texas
855 A&M University System, Purdue University System), Asia (e.g., Sun Yat Sen University,
856 Kyung Hee University, Zhejiang University), Australia (e.g., Griffith University, University of
857 Queensland), and Europe (e.g., University of Surrey, Bournemouth University).
- 858 – Some systems and multi-campus networks (e.g., Texas A&M University System, California
859 State University System) indicate that research in tourism is often supported by large academic
860 networks.

861 • **Specialized and Regional Institutions:**

- 862 – A number of affiliations are focused on regional and applied research (e.g., Breda University of
863 Applied Sciences, Macau University of Science and Technology), suggesting a strong applied
864 orientation in tourism scholarship.
- 865 – There are also specialized institutions that appear to concentrate on tourism/hospitality studies,
866 such as City University of Macau and Taylor's University.

867 **Interpretation**

868 • **Geographic Diversity and Focus:**

- 869 – The high-ranking affiliations come from regions with dynamic tourism sectors, suggesting that
870 local industry relevance and regional economic importance drive research output.
- 871 – Institutions from Florida, Hong Kong, and Australia dominate, reflecting their strong tourism
872 industries and established research infrastructures.

873 • **Institutional Networks and Research Clusters:**

- 874 – University systems (e.g., State University System of Florida, Texas A&M University System,
875 California State University System) contribute significantly, demonstrating the role of institu-
876 tional networks in fostering collaborative and high-volume research.

- 877 – The presence of both comprehensive universities and specialized institutions points to a balance
 878 between theoretical and applied research in tourism and hospitality.


879 • **Impact on Policy and Practice:**

- 880 – Leading institutions often inform both academic debates and practical policy decisions in
 881 tourism. Their high article counts suggest they are key players in shaping sustainable tourism
 882 practices and industry standards.

883 **Conclusion & Summary**

884 Overall, the distribution of articles across affiliations shows a **broad and globally diverse** network of insti-
 885 tutions contributing to tourism research. A few key players—especially from regions with strong tourism
 886 industries—dominate the field, while a wide range of universities, from large state systems to specialized
 887 and regional institutions, enrich the research landscape with varied perspectives and applied insights.

888 **In summary**, the data underscore that major research outputs in tourism are concentrated in a handful of
 889 influential affiliations, reflecting regional economic importance, robust institutional networks, and a balance
 890 between theoretical and practical contributions in the field.



891

892 **Affiliations' Production over time**

Affiliation	Articles
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA	104
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	97
GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY	73
SUN YAT SEN UNIVERSITY	56
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA	55
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	40
UNIVERSIDADE DO ALGARVE	40
UNIVERSITY OF JOHANNESBURG	40
PENNSYLVANIA COMMONWEALTH SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION (PCSHE)	38
UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND	38
UNIVERSITY OF SURREY	36
GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY - GOLD COAST CAMPUS	34
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY	32
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY SYSTEM	29
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM	28
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY COLLEGE STATION	28
BREDA UNIVERSITY OF APPLIED SCIENCES	27
PURDUE UNIVERSITY	27
PURDUE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM	27
UNIVERSITY OF OTAGO	27
SEJONG UNIVERSITY	26
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS SYSTEM	25
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST	24
BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY	23
MACAU UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	23
TAYLOR'S UNIVERSITY	23
ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY	23
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	22
CITY UNIVERSITY OF MACAU	22
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA	21
PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY	20
UNIVERSIDADE DE AVEIRO	20
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY	20

893 The table provided represents a bibliometric analysis of the production of articles related across different
894 universities and university systems over a span of approximately two decades. Here's an elaboration and
895 interpretation of the results for each institution:

896 **Description**

897 The table displays the yearly article output for several key affiliations in tourism research. Notable patterns
898 include:

899 • **Delayed Start & Gradual Onset:**

- 900 – Many institutions (e.g., **Kyung Hee University**, **Hong Kong Polytechnic University**, **University of Queensland**, and **State University System of Florida**) show no production in the
901 early 1990s through the early 2000s.
902
903 – Production begins modestly (often 1–2 articles per year) in the mid-2000s.

904 • **Steady Increase with Recent Acceleration:**

- 905 – Over time, article counts gradually increase. For example, **Kyung Hee University** increases
906 from 2–5 articles in the 2003–2013 period, reaching 13–14 articles by 2019–2021, and then
907 leaping to 39–40 articles in 2024–2025.
908
909 – **Hong Kong Polytechnic University** similarly grows slowly until around 2014–2015, then
910 accelerates dramatically: from 10 articles in 2016 to 90–97 articles by 2024–2025.
911
912 – Other affiliations, such as the **State University System of Florida** and **University of Central**
913 **Florida**, show a similar pattern—little or no output in the early years and then a rapid ramp-up
914 in the 2010s, peaking in the early 2020s.

915 • **Variation Among Institutions:**

- 916 – While some institutions like **University of Queensland** and **Sun Yat Sen University** also
917 show an upward trend, the magnitude and pace vary.
918
919 – For instance, **Universidade do Algarve** had negligible output until 2017 and then a marked
920 increase in recent years (from 1 article per year up to 39–40 articles by 2024–2025).

921 **Interpretation**

922 • **Field Maturation and Increased Emphasis:**

923 The nearly universal absence of articles before the mid-2000s suggests that tourism research, at least
924 as indexed in this dataset, was either in its infancy or not a priority at many institutions. The subse-
925 quent growth reflects:

- 926 – A **maturation of the field** as tourism became an increasingly important economic, social, and
927 environmental subject.
928 – **Enhanced institutional support** and funding for tourism/hospitality research over time.

930 • **Exponential Growth in Recent Years:**

931 The accelerated output from around 2018 onward for many affiliations (e.g., Hong Kong Polytechnic
932 University, State University System of Florida) likely indicates:

- 933 – A surge in research interest driven by global trends such as sustainability, digital transformation
934 (e.g., virtual tourism), and the COVID-19 pandemic's impact on travel.
935 – Greater collaboration and interdisciplinary approaches that boost publication output.


936 • **Regional Differences:**

937 Institutions in regions with vibrant tourism industries (e.g., Florida, Hong Kong, Australia) exhibit
938 particularly high growth rates. In contrast, some institutions with later entry into the field (e.g., Uni-
939 versidade do Algarve) show a delayed but rapid ramp-up, perhaps as the region's tourism issues
940 gained prominence.

941 **Conclusion & Summary**

942 The data reveal that the production of tourism research has experienced a significant, mostly exponential
943 increase over the past two decades. While many key affiliations showed little or no output in the early years,
944 all have ramped up their production substantially, with especially dramatic increases observed from around
945 2018 onward.

946 **In summary**, these trends underscore the growing academic and practical importance of tourism research
947 worldwide. The consistent rise in article output across diverse institutions reflects both a maturing field and
948 the increasing global relevance of tourism, sustainability, and hospitality studies.



Affiliation	Year	Articles
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	1992	0
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	1995	0
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	1996	0
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2001	0
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2002	0
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2003	2
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2004	2
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2005	2
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2006	3
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2007	3
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2008	4
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2009	4
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2010	5
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2011	5
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2012	5
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2013	5
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2014	6
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2015	7
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2016	7
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2017	7
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2018	11
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2019	13
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2020	13
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2021	14
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2022	18
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2023	23
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2024	39
KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY	2025	40
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	1992	0
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	1995	0
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	1996	0
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2001	0
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2002	0
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2003	0
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2004	0
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2005	0
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2006	0
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2007	1
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2008	1
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2009	1
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2010	1
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2011	1
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2012	1
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2013	1
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2014	2
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2015	3
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2016	10
HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	2017	12

950 **Countries**

951 **Corresponding Author's Countries**

952 The data presented offers a bibliometric analysis of psychological entitlement based on the country of the
953 corresponding author. Here's an interpretation and elaboration of the results:

954 **Description**

955 • **Top Producers by Article Count:**

- 956 – **China** leads with 304 articles ($\approx 19.58\%$ of total), followed by the **USA** with 261 articles
957 ($\approx 16.81\%$), and then the **United Kingdom** (116 articles, $\approx 7.47\%$) and **Australia** (107 articles,
958 $\approx 6.89\%$).
959
960 – Other notable contributors include **Korea** (80 articles), **Spain** (73), **Portugal** (53), **India** (48),
961 **Italy** (36), and **Canada** (33).

962 • **Collaboration Patterns (SCP vs. MCP):**

- 963 – **Single Country Publications (SCP)** vs. **Multiple Country Publications (MCP)** provide
964 insight into collaboration intensity. For example, China has 174 SCP and 130 MCP, meaning
965 about 42.76% of its output is international collaboration.
966
967 – The USA shows a lower international share at 33.72% (173 SCP vs. 88 MCP).
968
969 – In contrast, countries such as **Korea** (68.75% MCP) and **Malaysia** (68% MCP) have a high
970 proportion of multi-country collaborations.
971 – Some European countries (e.g., UK at 41.38%, Australia at 49.53%) show a balance between
972 domestic and international outputs, whereas others (e.g., Spain at 26.03%, India at 14.58%) lean
973 more toward domestic research.

974 **Interpretation**

975 • **Volume and Influence:**

- 976 – The top-producing countries (China, USA, UK, Australia) dominate overall production. Their
977 high output may be driven by strong national research systems, significant tourism industries,
978 and a high level of academic investment in tourism and hospitality studies.

979 • **International Collaboration Trends:**

- 980 – Higher MCP percentages in countries like Korea and Malaysia suggest that researchers there
981 are highly engaged in cross-border collaborations. This can enrich research by bringing diverse
982 perspectives and may reflect the strategic importance of global networks in rapidly evolving
983 tourism contexts.
984 – Lower MCP percentages for countries like India and Spain indicate that a larger share of their
985 research is produced domestically. This might reflect either a strong local research community
986 or less integration into international collaborative networks.


987 • **Regional Dynamics:**

- 988 – Many of the top-producing countries are from regions with vibrant tourism industries and strong
 989 governmental or institutional support for tourism research. The collaboration patterns can also
 990 hint at differences in research culture—some regions may prioritize international partnership
 991 while others focus on addressing local issues.

992 **Conclusion & Summary**

993 These country-level data reveal that a few countries (China and the USA, in particular) produce a significant
 994 share of tourism research, while international collaboration levels vary considerably. Higher international
 995 collaboration percentages in countries like Korea and Malaysia suggest that global networks play a critical
 996 role in advancing their research, whereas other nations tend to produce more domestic work.

997 **In summary,** the data underscore both the concentration of research output in a few major countries and the
 998 diverse collaboration strategies that reflect regional priorities and research cultures in the field of tourism
 999 and hospitality.



1001 **Countries' Scientific Production**

1002 **Description**

1003 • **Top Producers by Region:**

Country	Articles	Articles.%	SCP	MCP	MCP.%
CHINA	304	19.5750161	174	130	42.76316
USA	261	16.8061816	173	88	33.71648
UNITED KINGDOM	116	7.4694140	68	48	41.37931
AUSTRALIA	107	6.8898905	54	53	49.53271
KOREA	80	5.1513200	25	55	68.75000
SPAIN	73	4.7005795	54	19	26.02740
PORTUGAL	53	3.4127495	41	12	22.64151
INDIA	48	3.0907920	41	7	14.58333
ITALY	36	2.3180940	27	9	25.00000
CANADA	33	2.1249195	19	14	42.42424
NEW ZEALAND	32	2.0605280	18	14	43.75000
TURKEY	29	1.8673535	18	11	37.93103
MALAYSIA	25	1.6097875	8	17	68.00000
NETHERLANDS	23	1.4810045	14	9	39.13043
BRAZIL	19	1.2234385	16	3	15.78947
AUSTRIA	18	1.1590470	9	9	50.00000
FINLAND	18	1.1590470	9	9	50.00000
JAPAN	17	1.0946555	10	7	41.17647
THAILAND	15	0.9658725	8	7	46.66667
NORWAY	12	0.7726980	6	6	50.00000
SOUTH AFRICA	12	0.7726980	7	5	41.66667
SWITZERLAND	12	0.7726980	8	4	33.33333
IRAN	10	0.6439150	4	6	60.00000
INDONESIA	9	0.5795235	6	3	33.33333
POLAND	9	0.5795235	6	3	33.33333
FRANCE	8	0.5151320	5	3	37.50000
GERMANY	8	0.5151320	2	6	75.00000
MEXICO	8	0.5151320	4	4	50.00000
CROATIA	7	0.4507405	5	2	28.57143
VIETNAM	7	0.4507405	3	4	57.14286
CYPRUS	6	0.3863490	4	2	33.33333
SERBIA	6	0.3863490	1	5	83.33333
HUNGARY	5	0.3219575	2	3	60.00000
PAKISTAN	5	0.3219575	2	3	60.00000
SWEDEN	5	0.3219575	5	0	0.00000
GHANA	4	0.2575660	2	2	50.00000
ISRAEL	4	0.2575660	2	2	50.00000
OMAN	4	0.2575660	0	4	100.00000
RUSSIA	4	0.2575660	4	0	0.00000
SLOVENIA	4	0.2575660	4	0	0.00000
BANGLADESH	3	0.1931745	1	2	66.66667
CZECH REPUBLIC	3	0.1931745	3	0	0.00000
IRELAND	3	0.1931745	3	0	0.00000
JORDAN	3	0.1931745	2	1	33.33333
SINGAPORE	3	0.1931745	1	2	66.66667
U ARAB EMIRATES	3	0.1931745	2	1	33.33333
BULGARIA	2	0.1287830	2	0	0.00000
COLOMBIA	2	0.1287830	2	0	0.00000

- 1004 – **China** leads with 774 publications, followed by the **USA** (679) and **Australia** (287).
1005
1006 – Other significant contributors include the **UK** (282), **Spain** (172), **Portugal** (171), and **South**
1007 **Korea** (170). These regions represent a major portion of global tourism research output.

1008 • **Moderate Contribution from Other Regions:**

- 1009 – Countries such as **India** (105), **New Zealand** (82), **Malaysia** (81), and **Canada** (70) contribute
1010 notably fewer publications but still hold importance in the global tourism research landscape.

1011 • **Smaller Regional Contributions:**

- 1012 – Several countries in Europe and Asia have **lesser contributions** with countries like **Finland**,
1013 **Japan**, and **Austria** having around 30–40 publications, showing less intense involvement in
1014 tourism research compared to the top countries.

1015 • **Emerging or Niche Contributors:**

- 1016 – **Smaller countries** like **Vietnam** (20), **Poland** (19), **Ghana** (18), **Switzerland** (18), **Mexico**
1017 (17), and **Russia** (17) have a more specialized presence in tourism research.
1018 – **Emerging economies** such as **Ethiopia**, **Kazakhstan**, and **Uruguay** (2–3 publications) show
1019 **nascent involvement**, possibly linked to the growing interest in tourism within these regions.

1020 **Interpretation**

1021 • **Dominance of Major Tourism Markets:**

- 1022 – The most prolific regions—**China**, **USA**, **Australia**, **UK**—reflect the **global tourism leaders** in
1023 terms of both research output and tourism industry influence. These regions invest significantly
1024 in tourism studies due to their established academic and tourism infrastructures.

1025 • **Increasing Participation from Asia and Europe:**

- 1026 – **South Korea** and **Malaysia** show a strong growth trend, with **South Korea** reaching 170 publica-
1027 tions. This signals an expanding interest in tourism research in the **Asian market**, particularly
1028 in areas related to culture, sustainability, and technology in tourism.
1029 – **Portugal**, **Spain**, and **Italy** reflect strong regional engagement with tourism, likely tied to the
1030 **importance of tourism** to their respective economies and cultures.

1031 • **Global Disparities in Research Contribution:**

- 1032 – Regions like **Africa**, **South America**, and parts of **Eastern Europe** (e.g., **Nigeria**, **Ethiopia**,
1033 **Argentina**) contribute relatively fewer articles, signaling potential **gaps** in academic capacity
1034 or less research infrastructure dedicated to tourism.
1035 – Countries with fewer publications (e.g., **Bhutan**, **Morocco**, **Costa Rica**) are often niche players,
1036 possibly engaged in specific tourism sectors or facing more localized research needs.


1038 • **Research Diffusion and Specialization:**

- 1039 – Countries like **Qatar**, **Kazakhstan**, and **Nepal** show growing but still modest contributions.
1040 This suggests a **broadening of tourism scholarship**, especially in emerging markets or regions
1041 with developing tourism industries.

1042 **Conclusion & Summary**

1043 The data reveal a clear **concentration of tourism research** in a few regions such as **China**, **the USA**,
1044 **Australia**, and the **UK**, with **emerging contributions** from countries in **Asia**, **Europe**, and **Africa**. The
1045 varying article counts reflect global disparities in research focus, academic infrastructure, and regional
1046 tourism development.

1047 **In summary**, the data point to **established regions dominating tourism research** while others are begin-
1048 ning to engage more actively. This highlights **regional specialization** and **growing interest** in tourism
1049 research worldwide, indicating the field's broadening scope and diverse focus areas across the globe.



1050

1051 **Countries' Production over Time**

1052 **Description**

1053 • **USA**

- 1054 – The USA shows a **gradual increase** in publications from **1992 (1 article)** to **2025 (679 articles)**.
1055 – A **significant surge** begins around 2010, with output increasing from **26 articles in 2010** to **377**
1056 **articles in 2021**.

region	Freq
CHINA	774
USA	679
AUSTRALIA	287
UK	282
SPAIN	172
PORTUGAL	171
SOUTH KOREA	170
INDIA	105
NEW ZEALAND	82
MALAYSIA	81
CANADA	70
ITALY	67
TURKEY	66
SOUTH AFRICA	63
NETHERLANDS	62
BRAZIL	54
FINLAND	40
JAPAN	38
AUSTRIA	35
NORWAY	33
THAILAND	32
FRANCE	30
INDONESIA	28
IRAN	25
GERMANY	23
PAKISTAN	23
VIETNAM	20
POLAND	19
GHANA	18
SWITZERLAND	18
MEXICO	17
RUSSIA	17
SERBIA	17
SINGAPORE	15
CROATIA	12
SWEDEN	12
CYPRUS	10
HUNGARY	10
PHILIPPINES	10
SLOVENIA	10
BANGLADESH	9
CHILE	9
IRELAND	9
OMAN	9
CZECH REPUBLIC	7
EGYPT	7
ETHIOPIA	7
JORDAN	7

- 1057 – **Post-2020**, the USA maintains strong growth, producing **314 articles in 2020, 457 in 2022**, and
1058 **650 articles in 2024**.

1059 • **China**

- 1060 – **China** starts with almost no publications until **2007** (2 articles), then **gradually ramps up** in
1061 the following years.
1062 – In recent years, China has seen explosive growth, with **272 articles in 2021, 340 in 2022**, and
1063 **485 in 2023**.
1064 – By **2025**, China is projected to produce **774 articles**, surpassing the USA.

1066 • **United Kingdom**

- 1067 – The UK also sees a **steady increase**, especially from **2016 (33 articles)** to **2025 (282 articles)**.
1068 – A significant **jump in production** occurs after **2019** as the UK's article output reaches **94 in**
1069 **2020** and **154 in 2022**.

1071 • **Australia**

- 1072 – **Australia** shows consistent growth from **2006 (1 article)** to **287 articles in 2025**.
1073 – A major increase occurs in the last decade, from **38 articles in 2016** to **227 articles in 2023**,
1074 with projections to exceed **282 articles** in 2024.

1075 • **South Korea**

- 1076 – South Korea shows a **modest but steady rise**, starting from **4 articles in 2003** to **170 articles**
1077 **in 2025**.
1078 – The output grows rapidly starting around **2018**, with **53 articles** in 2019 and **68 in 2020**, peaking
1079 at **166 articles in 2024**.

1080 • **Portugal**

- 1081 – **Portugal** starts with very few articles and slowly increases production after **2013**. By **2025**, it
1082 reaches **171 articles**.
1083 – Recent years have seen substantial growth, with **104 articles in 2023** and projections to hit **162**
1084 **in 2024**.

1085 • **New Zealand**

- 1086 – **New Zealand** shows slow and steady growth, from **0 articles in 1992** to **82 articles in 2025**.
1087
1088 – The recent surge is evident, especially in **2020** (40 articles) and continuing through **2023** (72
1089 articles).

1090 • **India**

- 1091 – **India** had a **slow start** with only **1 article in 2017**, but the pace picked up dramatically after
1092 **2020**, with **100 articles projected in 2024** and **105 articles in 2025**.
1093
1094 – **India's growth** is significant, reflecting increasing academic interest in tourism studies.

1095 **Interpretation**

1096 • **Exponential Growth in Major Countries:**

1097 – The USA, China, and the UK show exponential growth, especially after **2010**, with an acceleration
1098 in the **2020s**. This suggests an increasing recognition of tourism research as a key academic
1099 and policy area.

1100 • **Emerging Global Players:**

1101 – **China's rise** in recent years, especially from **2020 onward**, reflects its growing tourism industry,
1102 which is now a **global leader** in both academic research and tourism practice.
1103 – **South Korea and Portugal** show steady growth, with South Korea maintaining a higher proportion
1104 of international collaborations.


1105 • **Smaller Regions Showing Increasing Production:**

1106 – **New Zealand and India** demonstrate rapid progress in recent years, particularly as the tourism
1107 sectors in these regions receive more global attention.

1108 **Conclusion & Summary**

1109 Overall, **global tourism research** is witnessing **substantial growth**, with key countries like **USA, China, UK, and Australia** driving a large share of publications. The steady rise of **South Korea, Portugal, and New Zealand**, along with **India's exponential growth** post-2020, highlights a **maturing field** in diverse global contexts.

1110 **In summary**, these trends reflect the **global expansion** of tourism scholarship, underscoring the increasing
1111 importance of tourism research across all regions, driven by both **academic interest** and the **rapid evolution**
1112 of **global tourism markets**.



1116

Country	Year	Articles
USA	1992	1
USA	1995	1
USA	1996	1
USA	2001	1
USA	2002	1
USA	2003	2
USA	2004	2
USA	2005	2
USA	2006	4
USA	2007	6
USA	2008	8
USA	2009	16
USA	2010	26
USA	2011	34
USA	2012	40
USA	2013	66
USA	2014	84
USA	2015	106
USA	2016	142
USA	2017	174
USA	2018	214
USA	2019	254
USA	2020	314
USA	2021	377
USA	2022	457
USA	2023	545
USA	2024	650
USA	2025	679
NEW ZEALAND	1992	0
NEW ZEALAND	1995	0
NEW ZEALAND	1996	0
NEW ZEALAND	2001	1
NEW ZEALAND	2002	1
NEW ZEALAND	2003	1
NEW ZEALAND	2004	1
NEW ZEALAND	2005	2
NEW ZEALAND	2006	2
NEW ZEALAND	2007	2
NEW ZEALAND	2008	2
NEW ZEALAND	2009	2
NEW ZEALAND	2010	2
NEW ZEALAND	2011	3
NEW ZEALAND	2012	3
NEW ZEALAND	2013	3
NEW ZEALAND	2014	48
NEW ZEALAND	2015	6
NEW ZEALAND	2016	7
NEW ZEALAND	2017	11

1117 **Most Cited Countries**

1118 **Description**

1119 • **Top Cited Countries:**

- 1120 – **USA** leads with a total of **12,019 citations**, with an average of **46 citations per article**.
- 1121 – **China** (6,727 citations, 22.1 citations per article) and the **United Kingdom** (4,930 citations, 42.5 citations per article) are the next most cited countries.
- 1124 – Other high-impact countries include **Italy** (average 50.2 citations), **Malaysia** (45.2 citations),
1125 and **Hungary** (75.4 citations), which show strong citation rates relative to their number of arti-
1126 cles.
1127

1128 • **Moderate Citation Countries:**

- 1129 – **Australia** (3,613 citations, 33.8 citations per article), **Korea** (2,719 citations, 34 citations per
1130 article), and **Spain** (1,890 citations, 25.9 citations per article) also have a solid citation output
1131 but at a lower rate compared to the leading countries.

1132 • **Countries with Lower Citations:**

- 1133 – **Portugal** (605 citations, 11.4 citations per article) and **South Africa** (161 citations, 13.4 cita-
1134 tions per article) have a lower total citation count, which may be due to fewer articles or a more
1135 recent entry into the tourism research field.

1136 • **Niche or Emerging Contributors:**

- 1137 – Countries like **Mauritius** (99 citations, 99 citations per article), **Estonia** (94.5 citations per
1138 article), and **United Arab Emirates** (90 citations per article) have high average citation counts,
1139 despite publishing fewer articles, reflecting their emerging prominence in niche areas of tourism
1140 research.

1141 **Interpretation**

1142 1. **High Citation Countries (USA, China, UK):**

- 1143 • The **USA**, **China**, and **United Kingdom** are clearly the dominant players in the tourism research
1144 field. The **USA**'s total citation count is significantly higher, reflecting its well-established re-
1145 search infrastructure, extensive tourism industry, and academic influence.
- 1146 • **China's growth** in citations reflects its expanding importance as a global tourism destination
1147 and the growing academic focus on Chinese tourism-related studies.

1148 2. **Countries with High Citations per Article:**

- 1149 • **Hungary**, **UAE**, and **Estonia** stand out with high citations per article, suggesting that their
1150 contributions, while fewer, are highly influential in the field. These countries may be publishing
1151 fewer articles, but those that are published have a **strong impact** on the academic discourse.

1152 3. **Balanced Citation-Production Relationship:**

- 1153 • **Australia** and **Korea** show a **steady output** with a **reasonable** number of citations per article.
 1154 This suggests a **healthy level of international recognition** for their work, with a growing
 1155 academic presence in tourism studies.


1156 **4. Moderate to Low Citation Impact in Some Regions:**

- 1157 • Countries such as **South Africa**, **Portugal**, **Thailand**, and **India** show relatively lower citation
 1158 counts. This could reflect **smaller research outputs** or the **recent growth** of their tourism
 1159 research communities.
 1160 • Countries like **Vietnam**, **Greece**, and **Sri Lanka** have low citation counts, potentially due to
 1161 their **more niche or emerging status** in global tourism research.

1162 **Conclusion & Summary**

1163 The data reveal a **clear dominance** of countries like the **USA**, **China**, and the **UK** in terms of total citations,
 1164 with **Italy**, **Malaysia**, and **Hungary** standing out for their **high citation per article** ratios. Emerging
 1165 countries such as **Mauritius** and **Estonia** demonstrate significant influence relative to their article output,
 1166 suggesting targeted contributions to key areas of tourism research.

1167 **In summary**, the global tourism research landscape is highly concentrated in a few countries but also features significant contributions from **niche** and **emerging regions** with increasing academic influence. The
 1168 **USA**, **China**, and the **UK** continue to lead, while **smaller countries** are gaining momentum, particularly
 1169 in specific research areas.



Country	TC	Average.Article.Citations
USA	12019	46.0
CHINA	6727	22.1
UNITED KINGDOM	4930	42.5
AUSTRALIA	3613	33.8
KOREA	2719	34.0
SPAIN	1890	25.9
ITALY	1807	50.2
NETHERLANDS	1270	55.2
NEW ZEALAND	1218	38.1
INDIA	1145	23.9
MALAYSIA	1129	45.2
CANADA	841	25.5
FINLAND	622	34.6
PORTUGAL	605	11.4
AUSTRIA	456	25.3
TURKEY	416	14.3
JAPAN	401	23.6
HUNGARY	377	75.4
THAILAND	314	20.9
ISRAEL	284	71.0
SWITZERLAND	278	23.2
U ARAB EMIRATES	270	90.0
MEXICO	268	33.5
IRAN	255	25.5
SLOVENIA	222	55.5
NORWAY	214	17.8
MAURITIUS	198	99.0
ESTONIA	189	94.5
SOUTH AFRICA	161	13.4
GERMANY	155	19.4
SWEDEN	148	29.6
FRANCE	132	16.5
SERBIA	111	18.5
CYPRUS	104	17.3
BRAZIL	100	5.3
PAKISTAN	96	19.2
VIETNAM	74	10.6
INDONESIA	68	7.6
POLAND	55	6.1
DENMARK	53	26.5
IRELAND	52	17.3
RUSSIA	46	11.5
SINGAPORE	40	13.3
ROMANIA	32	32.0
CROATIA	29	4.61
BANGLADESH	28	9.3
GHANA	25	6.2
FJJI	21	10.5

1172 **Documents**

1173 **Documents**

1174 **Most Global Cited Documents**

1175 **Description**

1176 • **Document Diversity:**

1177 The table lists key documents in tourism research, identified by paper title, DOI, total citations, cita-
1178 tions per year, and a normalized citation score. These documents span a range of publication years
1179 and include both seminal and more recent contributions.

1180 • **Citation Metrics:**

1181 – **Total Citations (TC)** vary widely—from documents with over 700 citations (e.g., *SHARPLEY*
1182 *R, 2014* with 704 TC) to those in the lower range (e.g., several papers with TC around 10–20).

1183 – **Citations per Year (TC per Year)** show how frequently a paper is cited on an annual basis.
1184 Notably, some recent documents (e.g., *ZHENG DN, 2021* with 97.6 TC per Year) have very
1185 high annual citation rates, suggesting rapid recognition.

1186 – **Normalized TC** adjusts citation counts for factors such as publication age, highlighting the rela-
1187 tive impact. Here, values range significantly—for instance, *ZHENG DN, 2021* has a normalized
1188 TC of 16.27, whereas others are below 1, indicating that some papers are far more influential
1189 relative to their publication time.

1190 • **Journal Sources and Authorship:**

1191 The documents are published in well-regarded journals (e.g., *Annals of Tourism Research*, *Journal*
1192 *of Travel Research*, *Tourism Management*) and represent contributions from prominent authors, rein-
1193 forcing their status as key works in the field.

1194 **Interpretation**

1195 • **Seminal Contributions:**

1196 Papers with very high total citations and normalized scores (e.g., *SHARPLEY R, 2014* and *ZHENG*
1197 *DN, 2021*) are likely to be seminal studies. Their high TC per Year values further suggest that these
1198 works have had a strong and sustained impact over time.

1199 • **Rapid Uptake of Recent Research:**

1200 Some recent publications show impressive annual citation rates. For example, *ZHENG DN, 2021*
1201 achieves 97.6 citations per year, which, when normalized, indicates an exceptional influence com-
1202 pared to peers published in similar time frames.

1203 • **Relative Impact Variability:**

1204 The wide range in normalized TC values reflects differences in how papers perform relative to the
1205 expected citation rate for their publication age. Documents with normalized TC values well above 1
1206 are outperforming the typical citation benchmarks in tourism research.


1207 • **Field Evolution:**

1208 The mix of older, highly cited documents with more recent works that are rapidly accumulating ci-
 1209 tations illustrates the dynamic evolution of tourism research. It underscores that while foundational
 1210 works continue to be referenced, innovative new studies are also making significant impacts.

1211 **Conclusion & Summary**

1212 The analysis of the most globally cited documents in tourism research reveals a heterogeneous but influ-
 1213 ential set of publications. Key papers—such as those by *SHARPLEY R (2014)* and *ZHENG DN (2021)*—
 1214 demonstrate both high cumulative and annual citation metrics, marking them as seminal contributions. The
 1215 normalized citation scores further confirm that some documents have an impact far exceeding the norm
 1216 for their publication period. In summary, this bibliometric snapshot highlights not only the long-standing
 1217 foundational studies in tourism research but also emerging works that are rapidly shaping the field.

1218 SHARPLEY R, 2014, TOURISM MANAGE
 DEL BOSQUE IR, 2008, ANN TOURISM RES
 ANDERECK KL, 2011, J TRAVEL RES
 UYSAL M, 2016, TOURISM MANAGE
 KIM K, 2013, TOURISM MANAGE
 ZHENG DN, 2021, TOURISM MANAGE
 SHARMA GD, 2021, TOUR MANAG PERSPECT
 MCCABE S, 2013, ANN TOURISM RES
 GILBERT D, 2004, ANN TOURISM RES
 WOO E, 2015, ANN TOURISM RES
 QIU RTR, 2020, ANN TOURISM RES
 HUANG YC, 2016, INT J TOUR RES
 SMITH MK, 2017, ANN TOURISM RES
 SIRGY MJ, 2011, J TRAVEL RES
 CRAICOLICI MF, 2009, TOURISM MANAGE
 RASOOLMANESH SM, 2017, TOURISM MANAGE
 LEE TH, 2019, TOURISM MANAGE
 KIM H, 2015, TOURISM MANAGE
 MATHIS EF, 2016, ANN TOURISM RES
 DOLNICAR S, 2012, ANN TOURISM RES
 TEW C, 2012, TOURISM MANAGE
 LIN ZB, 2017, TOURISM MANAGE
 PENCARELLI T, 2020, INF TECHNOL TOUR
 RAMKISOON H, 2023, J SUSTAIN TOUR
 CHEN CC, 2013, J TRAVEL RES
 RASOOLMANESH SM, 2015, TOUR MANAG PERSPECT
 KNOBLICH U, 2017, J TRAVEL RES
 POMFRET G, 2008, TOURISM MANAGE
 HSU CHC, 2007, TOURISM MANAGE
 BUONINCONTRI P, 2017, TOURISM MANAGE



1218

1219 **Most Local Cited Documents**

1220 This section examines the most locally cited documents in our dataset. The table below provides key met-
 1221 rics for each document including: - **Local Citations**: Citations received within the local (disciplinary or
 1222 community-specific) dataset. - **Global Citations**: Total citations received worldwide. - **Ratio**: The percent-
 1223 age of local citations relative to global citations. - **Normalized Local/Global Citations**: Citation counts
 1224 that have been adjusted (typically by publication age) to allow fairer comparisons across documents.

1225 **Description**

Paper	DOI	Total
SHARPLEY R, 2014, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2013.10.007	
DEL BOSQUE IR, 2008, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2008.02.006	
ANDERECK KL, 2011, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287510362918	
UYSAL M, 2016, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2015.07.013	
KIM K, 2013, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2012.09.005	
ZHENG DN, 2021, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104261	
SHARMA GD, 2021, TOUR MANAG PERSPECT	10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100786	
MCCABE S, 2013, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2012.12.001	
GILBERT D, 2004, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2003.06.001	
WOO E, 2015, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2014.11.001	
QIU RTR, 2020, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2020.102994	
HUANG YC, 2016, INT J TOUR RES	10.1002/jtr.2038	
SMITH MK, 2017, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2017.05.006	
SIRGY MJ, 2011, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287510362784	
CRACOLICI MF, 2009, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2008.07.006	
RASOOLIMANESH SM, 2017, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2016.11.019	
LEE TH, 2019, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2018.09.003	
KIM H, 2015, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2014.08.002	
MATHIS EF, 2016, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2015.11.023	
DOLNICAR S, 2012, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2011.04.015	
TEW C, 2012, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2011.02.005	
LIN ZB, 2017, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2017.02.013	
PENCARELLI T, 2020, INF TECHNOL TOUR	10.1007/s40558-019-00160-3	
RAMKISSOON H, 2023, J SUSTAIN TOUR	10.1080/09669582.2020.1858091	
CHEN CC, 2013, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287513496477	
RASOOLIMANESH SM, 2015, TOUR MANAG PERSPECT	10.1016/j.tmp.2015.10.001	
KNOBLOCH U, 2017, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287516650937	
POMFRET G, 2006, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2004.08.003	
HSU CHC, 2007, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2006.09.015	
BUONINCONTRI P, 2017, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2017.04.014	
JAMAL T, 2014, J SUSTAIN TOUR	10.1080/09669582.2013.786084	
BOLEY BB, 2017, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2016.10.002	
CURTIN S, 2009, CURR ISSUES TOUR	10.1080/13683500903042857	
YOLAL M, 2016, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2016.07.008	
GURSOY D, 2019, J HOSP MARKET MANAG	10.1080/19368623.2018.1516589	
PEARCE PL, 2013, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2012.10.002	
NAWIJN J, 2013, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287512465961	
VANDERBORG J, 1996, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/0160-7383(95)00065-8	
WANG J, 2019, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2019.102743	
NAWIJN J, 2011, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287510379164	
RIBEIRO MA, 2017, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2017.03.004	
MATHEW PV, 2017, J HOSP TOUR MANAG	10.1016/j.jhtm.2016.10.001	
GANNON M, 2021, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287519890926	
STHAPIT E, 2018, SCAND J HOSP TOUR	10.1080/15022250.2017.1287003	
SIRGY MJ, 2010, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287509337476	
AGYEIWAAH E, 2017, TOUR MANAG PERSPECT	10.1016/j.tmp.2017.07.005	
CHEN CC, 2016, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287514546223	
RAMKISSOON H, 2018, J SUSTAIN TOUR	10.1080/09669582.2017.1354866	

1226 • Citation Distribution

- 1227 – The documents show a wide variation in both local and global citations. For instance, *UYSAL M, 2016*, *TOURISM MANAGE* received 256 local and 554 global citations, whereas other papers
1228 in the lower part of the list have local citations as low as 1–2.
1229 – The **Ratio** (Local/Global × 100) ranges broadly. Some documents (e.g., *UYSAL M, 2016*) have
1230 a ratio near 46%, meaning nearly half of their citations come from the local community, while
1231 others (e.g., *SHARPLEY R, 2014*) have a lower ratio (~16%), indicating a greater share of cita-
1232 tions coming from outside the local context.
1233

1234 • Normalized Citation Metrics

- 1235 – The **Normalized Local Citations** vary from below 1 to over 14, and the **Normalized Global**
1236 **Citations** range similarly. These numbers adjust for factors like publication age so that more
1237 recent papers are compared fairly with older, more established works.
1238 – For example, *VADA S, 2020*, *TOURMANAG PERSPECT* shows a high normalized local citation
1239 (13.43) compared to a normalized global citation of 3.89, suggesting a very strong local impact
1240 relative to its overall citation performance.

1241 • Publication Year Spread

- 1242 – The sample spans from earlier publications (e.g., 2004) to recent works (projected up to 2025).
1243 Older documents tend to accumulate higher absolute citation counts, but normalization helps
1244 reveal their relative impact when accounting for the time available to be cited.

1245 Interpretation

1246 • Local vs. Global Impact

- 1247 – A high **Local/Global Ratio** implies that a document is especially influential within its local
1248 research community. For instance, *UYSAL M (2016)* with a ratio of 46.2% indicates that nearly
1249 half of its influence is local.
1250 – Conversely, documents with a lower ratio (e.g., *SHARPLEY R, 2014* at 16.3%) may have broader
1251 global appeal and are cited more by researchers outside the immediate field.

1252 • Normalized Citation Insights

- 1253 – The normalized metrics help in comparing documents of different ages. A high normalized
1254 local citation value (such as that for *VADA S, 2020*) highlights a paper that, despite being newer,
1255 has achieved substantial local recognition.
1256 – In some cases, normalized global citations remain high (e.g., *SHARPLEY R, 2014* and *KIM K,*
1257 *2013*), indicating that these documents not only serve as core references in the local community
1258 but also enjoy widespread international attention.

1259 • Variability Across Documents

- 1260 – The variation in both absolute and normalized citation metrics suggests diversity in research im-
1261 pact. Some papers achieve a strong local resonance while others gain more global recognition.
1262 – The distribution also reflects disciplinary differences and possibly the evolving citation practices
1263 within the field over time.


1264 **Conclusion & Summary**

1265 **Conclusion:**

1266 The analysis of the most locally cited documents reveals distinct patterns of impact. Some documents (e.g.,
 1267 *UYSAL M, 2016*) are highly influential within the local research community, as evidenced by a high local-
 1268 to-global citation ratio and strong normalized local citation scores. In contrast, other seminal works such
 1269 as *SHARPLEY R, 2014* are characterized by a lower local ratio, indicating broader international recogni-
 1270 tion. The normalized metrics further allow us to compare documents across different publication years,
 1271 highlighting both enduring and emerging contributions.

1272 **Summary:**

1273 - **Pattern:** Wide variability in local and global citations with ratios ranging from ~16% to over 46%. Nor-
 1274 malized metrics adjust for publication age, revealing the relative local and global impacts. - **Interpretation:**
 1275 Documents with higher local ratios demonstrate stronger influence within the field's core community, while
 1276 those with lower ratios are more globally cited. Normalized values help identify papers that have rapidly
 1277 accumulated impact relative to their age. - **Overall:** This bibliometric snapshot underscores the dual di-
 1278 mensions of research influence—local and global—and highlights the dynamic and multifaceted nature of
 1279 scholarly impact in tourism research.



Document	DOI	Year	Local
UYBAL M, 2016, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2015.07.013	2016	
KIM K, 2013, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2012.09.005	2013	
ANDERECK KL, 2011, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287510362918	2011	
MCCABE S, 2013, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2012.12.001	2013	
GILBERT D, 2004, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2003.06.001	2004	
SMITH MK, 2017, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2017.05.006	2017	
WOO E, 2015, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2014.11.001	2015	
SIRGY MJ, 2011, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287510362784	2011	
SHARPLEY R, 2014, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2013.10.007	2014	
DOLNICAR S, 2012, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2011.04.015	2012	
KIM H, 2015, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2014.08.002	2015	
CHEN CC, 2013, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287513496477	2013	
NAWIJN J, 2011, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287510379164	2011	
VADA S, 2020, TOUR MANAG PERSPECT	10.1016/j.tmp.2019.100631	2020	
KNOBLOCH U, 2017, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287516650937	2017	
FILEP S, 2019, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287518759227	2019	
NAWIJN J, 2012, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287511426482	2012	
SIRGY MJ, 2010, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287509337416	2010	
CHEN Y, 2013, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2013.02.003	2013	
YOLAL M, 2016, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2016.07.008	2016	
LIANG ZX, 2016, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2016.05.001	2016	
SIRGY MJ, 2019, J TRAVEL TOUR MARK	10.1080/10548408.2018.1526757	2019	
MCCABE S, 2010, INT J TOUR RES	10.1002/jtr.791	2010	
PYKE S, 2016, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2016.02.004	2016	
RIVERA M, 2016, J DESTIN MARK MANAGE	10.1016/j.jdmm.2015.04.002	2016	
FILEP S, 2014, J HOSP TOUR RES	10.1177/1096348012436609	2014	
NAWIJN J, 2013, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287512465961	2013	
WOO E, 2018, J HOSP TOUR RES	10.1177/1096348016654971	2018	
NAWIJN J, 2010, INT J TOUR RES	10.1002/jtr.756	2010	
MORGAN N, 2015, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2015.02.015	2015	
CHEN CC, 2016, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2015.09.016	2016	
ESLAMI S, 2019, J TRAVEL TOUR MARK	10.1080/10548408.2019.1689224	2019	
LIN ZB, 2017, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2017.02.013	2017	
CHEN Y, 2018, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2017.10.009	2018	
RAMKISOON H, 2023, J SUSTAIN TOUR	10.1080/09669582.2020.1858091	2023	
RAHMANI K, 2018, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2018.06.008	2018	
KIM H, 2015, J TRAVEL TOUR MARK	10.1080/10548408.2014.997958	2015	
NUNKOO R, 2016, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287515592972	2016	
COGHLAN A, 2015, J SUSTAIN TOUR	10.1080/09669582.2014.986489	2015	
SU LJ, 2018, J HOSP TOUR RES	10.1177/1096348016671395	2018	
HARTWELL H, 2018, CURR ISSUES TOUR	10.1080/13683500.2016.1223609	2018	
UYBAL M, 2019, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2018.12.016	2019	
SU LJ, 2020, ANN TOURISM RES	10.1016/j.annals.2020.103008	2020	
CHEN CC, 2016, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287514546223	2016	
LAING JH, 2017, TOURISM MANAGE	10.1016/j.tourman.2017.04.004	2017	
MATHEW PV, 2017, J HOSP TOUR MANAG	10.1016/j.jhtm.2016.10.001	2017	
RIDDERSTAAT J, 2016, J TRAVEL RES	10.1177/0047287514532372	2016	
STHAPIT E, 2018, SCAND J HOSP TOUR	10.1080/15022250.2017.1287003	2018	

1281 **Cited References**1282 **Most Local Cited References**1283 **Description**1284 • **Skewed Citation Distribution:**

- 1285 – A few foundational works (e.g., Fornell, 1981 with 272 citations; Uysal, 2016 with 256 citations; Hair, 2010 with 240 citations) dominate the citation counts.
- 1286 – Many other references have citations ranging from the low teens up to around 70, indicating a long tail of influential but less cited works.

1289 • **Multidisciplinary Influences:**

- 1290 – The list includes works from marketing research (e.g., Fornell, 1981; Hair, 2010), psychology (e.g., Maslow, 1943; Kahneman, 2004), and tourism/hospitality (e.g., Uysal, 2016; Chen, 2013).
- 1291 – This suggests that local scholarship in tourism draws on a wide range of theories and methodologies.

1294 • **Seminal Theoretical and Methodological Contributions:**

- 1295 – Many references are recognized as key sources for measurement instruments and conceptual frameworks (e.g., the works on structural equation modeling, quality-of-life, and satisfaction).
- 1296 – Several classic texts (e.g., Maslow's works, Seligman's writings, and foundational works on social indicators) continue to influence current research.

1299 **Interpretation**1300 • **Central Role of Seminal Works:**

- 1301 – The highest cited references have become “canonical” in the field, serving as standard benchmarks and foundational theories that shape subsequent research.
- 1302 – High citation counts for works like Fornell (1981) and Uysal (2016) indicate their wide acceptance and use in building and validating measurement models and conceptual frameworks in tourism research.

1306 • **Interdisciplinary Nature of Research:**

- 1307 – The diversity of sources (from marketing and psychology to tourism and hospitality) highlights the interdisciplinary nature of research in this domain.
- 1308 – This integration enriches the field by providing multiple perspectives and robust methodological approaches.

1311 • **Enduring Influence and Evolving Scholarship:**

- 1312 – Many older references (e.g., seminal articles from the 1980s and 1990s) remain highly cited, which underscores their enduring influence.
- 1313 – Newer works, though cited less in absolute terms, are contributing to contemporary debates and methodologies, as seen with recent articles from 2020 and 2021.

1316 **Conclusion & Summary**

1317 **Conclusion:**

1318 The most locally cited references reveal a heavily skewed distribution where a few seminal works dominate
 1319 the landscape. These influential texts span across several disciplines, indicating the interdisciplinary foun-
 1320 dation of tourism and hospitality research. They serve as both the theoretical and methodological bedrock
 1321 of the field, guiding current studies and the development of new frameworks.

1322 **Summary:**


1323 **- Pattern:**

1324 - A small number of foundational works receive very high citation counts, while many other important
 1325 references are cited at levels between 10 and 70. - The references encompass a broad range of disciplines,
 1326 reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of tourism research. **- Interpretation:**

1327 - High citation counts point to the enduring impact of seminal studies in shaping measurement, theory,
 1328 and practice. - The diverse disciplinary sources underline how tourism research integrates insights from
 1329 psychology, marketing, and management. **- Overall:**

1330 - These locally cited references form the backbone of the scholarly community, serving as key resources that
 1331 inform research design, methodology, and theoretical development in tourism and hospitality studies.

- 1332 References
- FORNELL C, 1981, J MARKETING RES, V18, P39, DOI 10.2307/3151312
 UYSAL M, 2016, TOURISM MANAGE, V53, P244, DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2015.0
 HAIR J.F., 2010, MULTIVARIATE DATA ANALYSIS: A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE, V7T
 KIM K, 2013, TOURISM MANAGE, V36, P527, DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2012.09.
 ANDERECK KL, 2011, J TRAVEL RES, V50, P248, DOI 10.1177/004728751038629
 MCCABE S, 2013, ANN TOURISM RES, V41, P42, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2012.1
 GILBERT D, 2004, ANN TOURISM RES, V31, P103, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2003
 SMITH MK, 2017, ANN TOURISM RES, V66, P1, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2017.05
 WOO E, 2015, ANN TOURISM RES, V50, P84, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2014.11.0
 PODSAKOFF PM, 2003, J APPL PSYCHOL, V88, P879, DOI 10.1037/0021-9010.8
 ANDERECK KL, 2005, ANN TOURISM RES, V32, P1056, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2
 SIRGY MJ, 2011, J TRAVEL RES, V50, P281, DOI 10.1177/0047287510362784
 RYAN RM, 2001, ANNU REV PSYCHOL, V52, P141, DOI 10.1146/ANNUREV.PSYCH.
 AP J, 1992, ANN TOURISM RES, V19, P685, DOI 10.1016/0160-7383(92)90060
 SHARPLEY R, 2014, TOURISM MANAGE, V42, P37, DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2013
 DIENER E, 1984, PSYCHOL BULL, V95, P542, DOI 10.1037/0033-295X.95.3.54
 DIENER E, 1985, J PERS ASSESS, V49, P71, DOI 10.1207/S15327752JPA4901_...
 DOLNIGAR S, 2012, ANN TOURISM RES, V39, P59, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2011
 ANDERSON JC, 1988, PSYCHOL BULL, V103, P411, DOI 10.1037/0033-2999.103
 GURSOY D, 2002, ANN TOURISM RES, V29, P79, DOI 10.1016/S0160-7383(01)0
 NEAL J. D., 2007, JOURNAL OF TRAVEL RESEARCH, V46, P154, DOI 10.1177/0
 KIM H, 2015, TOURISM MANAGE, V46, P465, DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2014.08.
 HENSELER J, 2015, JACAD MARKET SCI, V43, P115, DOI 10.1007/S11747-014
 KO DW, 2002, TOURISM MANAGE, V23, P521, DOI 10.1016/S0261-5177(02)0000
 NEAL JD, 1999, J BUS RES, V44, P153, DOI 10.1016/S0148-2963(97)00197-5
 BUTLER RW, 1980, CAN GEOGR-GEOGR CAN, V24, P5, DOI 10.1111/J.1541-0064
 CHEN CC, 2013, J TRAVEL RES, V52, P709, DOI 10.1177/0047287513495477
 BAGOZZI R, 1988, JOURNAL OF THE ACADEMY OF MARKETING SCIENCE, V16, P7
 GURSOY D, 2004, ANN TOURISM RES, V31, P495, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2003.
 NAWIJN J, 2011, J TRAVEL RES, V50, P559, DOI 10.1177/0047287510379164



1332

1333 **References Spectroscopy**

Cited References

- FORNELL C, 1981, J MARKETING RES, V18, P39, DOI 10.2307/3151312
- UYSAL M, 2016, TOURISM MANAGE, V53, P244, DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2015.07.013
- HAIR J.F., 2010, MULTIVARIATE DATA ANALYSIS: A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE, V7TH ED.
- KIM K, 2013, TOURISM MANAGE, V36, P527, DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2012.09.005
- ANDERECK KL, 2011, J TRAVEL RES, V50, P248, DOI 10.1177/0047287510362918
- MCCABE S, 2013, ANN TOURISM RES, V41, P42, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2012.12.001
- GILBERT D, 2004, ANN TOURISM RES, V31, P103, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2003.06.001
- SMITH MK, 2017, ANN TOURISM RES, V66, P1, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2017.05.006
- WOO E, 2015, ANN TOURISM RES, V50, P84, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2014.11.001
- PODSAKOFF PM, 2003, J APPL PSYCHOL, V88, P879, DOI 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- ANDERECK KL, 2005, ANN TOURISM RES, V32, P1056, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2005.03.001
- SIRGY MJ, 2011, J TRAVEL RES, V50, P261, DOI 10.1177/0047287510362784
- RYAN RM, 2001, ANNU REV PSYCHOL, V52, P141, DOI 10.1146/ANNREV.PSYCH.52.1.141
- AP J, 1992, ANN TOURISM RES, V19, P665, DOI 10.1016/0160-7383(92)90060-3
- SHARPLEY R, 2014, TOURISM MANAGE, V42, P37, DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2013.10.007
- DIENER E, 1984, PSYCHOL BULL, V95, P542, DOI 10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542
- DIENER E, 1985, J PERS ASSESS, V49, P71, DOI 10.1207/S15327752JPA4901_13
- DOLNICAR S, 2012, ANN TOURISM RES, V39, P59, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2011.04.015
- ANDERSON JC, 1988, PSYCHOL BULL, V103, P411, DOI 10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411
- GURSOY D, 2002, ANN TOURISM RES, V29, P79, DOI 10.1016/S0160-7383(01)00028-7
- NEAL J. D., 2007, JOURNAL OF TRAVEL RESEARCH, V46, P154, DOI 10.1177/0047287507303977
- KIM H, 2015, TOURISM MANAGE, V46, P465, DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2014.08.002
- HENSELER J, 2015, J ACAD MARKET SCI, V43, P115, DOI 10.1007/S11747-014-0403-8
- KO DW, 2002, TOURISM MANAGE, V23, P521, DOI 10.1016/S0261-5177(02)00006-7
- NEAL JD, 1999, J BUS RES, V44, P153, DOI 10.1016/S0148-2963(97)00197-5
- BUTLER RW, 1980, CAN GEOGR-GEOGR CAN, V24, P5, DOI 10.1111/J.1541-0064.1980.TB00970.X
- CHEN CC, 2013, J TRAVEL RES, V52, P709, DOI 10.1177/0047287513496477
- BAGOZZI R., 1988, JOURNAL OF THE ACADEMY OF MARKETING SCIENCE, V16, P74, DOI 10.1007/BF00002877
- GURSOY D, 2004, ANN TOURISM RES, V31, P495, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2003.08.008
- NAWIJN J, 2011, J TRAVEL RES, V50, P559, DOI 10.1177/0047287510379164
- DEERY M, 2012, TOURISM MANAGE, V33, P64, DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2011.01.026
- LEE TH, 2013, TOURISM MANAGE, V34, P37, DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2012.03.007
- TUNG VWS, 2011, ANN TOURISM RES, V38, P1367, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2011.03.009
- VADA S, 2020, TOUR MANAG PERSPECT, V33, DOI 10.1016/J.TMP.2019.100631
- DIENER E, 1999, PSYCHOL BULL, V125, P276, DOI 10.1037//0033-2909.125.2.276
- NAWIJN J, 2010, APPL RES QUAL LIFE, V5, P35, DOI 10.1007/S11482-009-9091-9
- NUNKOO R, 2012, ANN TOURISM RES, V39, P243, DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2011.05.006
- STYLIDIS D, 2014, TOURISM MANAGE, V45, P260, DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2014.05.006
- KNOBLOCH U, 2017, J TRAVEL RES, V56, P651, DOI 10.1177/0047287516650937
- BRAUN V, 2021, QUAL RES PSYCHOL, V18, P328, DOI 10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238
- FILEP S, 2019, J TRAVEL RES, V58, P343, DOI 10.1177/0047287518759227
- ANDERECK K. L., 2000, JOURNAL OF TRAVEL RESEARCH, V39, P27, DOI 10.1177/004728750003900104
- NAWIJN J, 2012, J TRAVEL RES, V51, P531, DOI 10.1177/0047287511426482
- PERDUE RR, 1990, ANN TOURISM RES, V17, P586, DOI 10.1016/0160-7383(90)90029-Q
- HU LT, 1999, STRUCT EQU MODELING, V6, P4, DOI 10.1080/10705519909540118
- CROMPTON J. L., 1979, ANNALS OF TOURISM RESEARCH, V6, P408, DOI 10.1016/0160-7383(92)90128-C
- JUROWSKI C., 1997, JOURNAL OF TRAVEL RESEARCH, V36, P3
- HAIR JF, 2011, J MARKET THEORY PRAC, V19, P139, DOI 10.2753/MTP1069-6679190202

1334 When we talk about “References Spectroscopy” in the context of bibliometrics, we are drawing an analogy
1335 with the spectroscopic techniques used in the physical sciences to analyze materials based on the spectrum
1336 of the radiation they emit or absorb.

- 1337 • Reference Spectrum: Just as a material has a unique spectrum in physical spectroscopy, a research
1338 paper or topic will have a unique “spectrum” of references it cites. This spectrum can give insight into
1339 the foundational works for that paper or topic, indicating which previous works are most influential
1340 or relevant.
- 1341 • Analysis: By examining the “spectra” (or citation patterns) of multiple papers or topics, one can
1342 identify trends, clusters, and gaps in the research landscape. This is analogous to how one might use
1343 spectroscopy to categorize and analyze different materials based on their spectral signatures.
- 1344 • Evolution Over Time: Just as the spectrum of a star can tell us about its age and stage in the lifecycle,
1345 looking at the changing citation patterns or “spectra” over time can reveal how a field or topic has
1346 evolved. It can show which works have become foundational over time or which ones have fallen
1347 out of favor.
- 1348 • Intensity & Peaks: In physical spectroscopy, the intensity of certain peaks in a spectrum can indicate
1349 the concentration of specific elements or compounds. Similarly, in bibliometrics, certain references
1350 might be cited much more frequently than others, indicating their centrality or importance to the field.
1351 These “peaks” in the citation spectrum can point to seminal works or pivotal authors in a domain.
- 1352 • Comparative Analysis: By comparing the “spectra” of different papers, topics, or even researchers,
1353 one can identify overlaps, synergies, and distinctions. This can be useful for interdisciplinary research,
1354 collaboration opportunities, or understanding the landscape of a broad field.
- 1355 • Anomalies & Outliers: Sometimes, a spectrum will have unexpected peaks or features. In bibliomet-
1356 rics, unexpected citation patterns might indicate emerging areas of interest, interdisciplinary bridges,
1357 or even issues like citation cartels or excessive self-citation.
- 1358 • Application: Just as spectroscopy has practical applications in material identification, quality con-
1359 trol, and more, bibliometric “spectroscopy” can be used for research evaluation, funding allocation,
1360 curriculum design, and other academic or research management tasks.

1361 In essence, the concept of “References Spectroscopy” in bibliometrics is a metaphorical way of describing
1362 the deep analysis of citation patterns to understand the structure, evolution, and dynamics of scholarly
1363 research.

1364 The “Reference publication year spectroscopy” (RPYS) is a method to analyze the age of cited references in
1365 a given publication set. It can reveal the seminal works and foundational literature within a topic or domain.
1366 Let’s break down and interpret the given data on the bibliometric analysis:

1367 Description

- 1368 • Time Range and Citation Counts:

- 1369 – The data spans from as early as 1749 to 2025.
- 1370 – For each publication year, the table lists the number of citations received.
- 1371 – Two difference metrics are provided:
 - 1372 * **diffMedian5**: The difference relative to a 5-year median.
 - 1373 * **diffMedian**: The difference relative to an overall median.

- 1374 • Spectral Peaks:

- 1375 – Some years show very high citation counts (e.g., 1988: 772 citations; 1999: 1701 citations;
1376 2000: 2151 citations; 2010: 4595 citations; 2017: 6451 citations; 2020: 7480 citations).
1377 – These peaks indicate years in which particularly influential works were published.

1378 • **Recent Years and Decline:**

- 1379 – After 2020, citation counts drop significantly (e.g., 2021: 5502; 2022: 3648; 2023: 2525; 2024:
1380 1057; 2025: 39).
1381 – This decline is expected for very recent years since newer publications have had less time to be
1382 cited.

1383 **Interpretation**

1384 • **Foundational Works and Seminal Years:**

- 1385 – The peaks in certain years represent “spectral signatures” of foundational works in the field. For
1386 example:
1387 * **1988 Peak (772 citations, diffMedian = 316):** Suggests that seminal contributions pub-
1388 lished in 1988 have become critical reference points.
1389 * **Late 1990s to Early 2000s Peaks (1701–2151 citations):** Indicate a period of high impact
1390 research that likely shaped current theories and methodologies.
1391 * **2010 and Beyond:** The strong peak in 2010 (4595 citations) and subsequent increases
1392 through 2017 (6451 citations) highlight a modern wave of influential work.

1393 • **Evolution Over Time:**

- 1394 – The “spectrum” shows how the influential literature evolves:
1395 * Early periods (18th and 19th centuries) contribute sparsely.
1396 * Modern scholarship (late 20th century onward) provides a concentrated set of seminal
1397 works that dominate the citation landscape.

1398 • **Intensity and Anomalies:**

- 1399 – The intensity (i.e., the height of the peaks) points to the centrality of key publications.
1400 – Abrupt declines in very recent years are less a sign of diminishing quality than a reflection of
1401 citation lag—newer articles have not yet had sufficient time to accumulate citations.

1403 • **Comparative and Trend Analysis:**

- 1404 – By comparing the citation “spectra” across time intervals, one can identify periods of rapid
1405 development or paradigm shifts in the field.
1406 – The data can also be used to spot potential anomalies or emerging trends when unusual peaks
1407 or valleys appear.

1408 **Conclusion & Summary**

1409 **Conclusion:**

1410 Reference Publication Year Spectroscopy provides a “spectral fingerprint” of a research field by mapping
1411 the age distribution of cited literature. The analysis reveals that certain years—often corresponding to

¹⁴¹² seminal publications—dominate the citation landscape. Over time, these peaks mark periods of high impact
¹⁴¹³ and foundational contributions, while the recent decline reflects the natural citation lag for new works.

¹⁴¹⁴ **Summary:**

¹⁴¹⁵ - **Data Pattern:**


¹⁴¹⁶ - A wide temporal range with a few distinct peaks that highlight seminal publication years. - Difference
¹⁴¹⁷ metrics (diffMedian5 and diffMedian) help accentuate these peaks relative to typical citation levels.

¹⁴¹⁸ • **Interpretation:**

- ¹⁴¹⁹ – High citation peaks indicate the publication years of works that have become cornerstones of the
¹⁴²⁰ field.
- ¹⁴²¹ – The evolution of the spectrum shows how foundational literature has accumulated over time,
¹⁴²² with recent years naturally showing lower counts due to citation lag.

¹⁴²³ • **Overall Insight:**

- ¹⁴²⁴ – RPYS is a powerful bibliometric tool that, by “spectroscoping” reference publication years,
¹⁴²⁵ identifies the key historical contributions and tracks the evolution of scholarly influence within
¹⁴²⁶ a discipline.



¹⁴²⁷

Year	Reference	Freq	X4
1749	1	1	1
1750	0	0	0
1751	0	0	0
1752	0	0	0
1753	0	0	0
1754	0	0	0
1755	1	1	1
1756	0	0	0
1757	0	0	0
1758	0	0	0
1759	0	0	0
1760	0	0	0
1761	0	0	0
1762	1	1	1
1763	0	0	0
1764	0	0	0
1765	0	0	0
1766	0	0	0
1767	0	0	0
1768	0	0	0
1769	0	0	0
1770	0	0	0
1771	0	0	0
1772	0	0	0
1773	0	0	0
1774	0	0	0
1775	0	0	0
1776	0	0	0
1777	1	1	1
1778	0	0	0
1779	0	0	0
1780	0	0	0
1781	0	0	0
1782	0	0	0
1783	0	0	0
1784	0	0	0
1785	0	0	0
1786	0	0	0
1787	0	0	0
1788	1	1	1
1789	2	2	2
1790	0	0	0
1791	1	0	0
1792	0	-1	0
1793	Copyright © Chad (Chungil) Chae, since 2023	0	74
1794	1	0	0
1795	0	-1	0
1796	0	0	0

1428 **Words**

1429 **Most Frequent Words**

1430 The provided data lists the most relevant words and their occurrences in a bibliometric analysis related to
1431 the topic.

1432 **Description**

1433 • **High-Frequency Terms:**

- 1434 – *Quality-of-life* (371 occurrences), *satisfaction* (326), and *tourism* (294) dominate the list. These
1435 high frequencies indicate that these topics are central to the research field.
1436 – Other major terms include *happiness* (219), *perceptions* (204), *attitudes* (189), and *impact* (177).

1437 • **Thematic Clusters:**

- 1438 – **Well-Being and Quality:** Words like *quality-of-life*, *satisfaction*, *happiness*, and *life satisfaction*
1439 suggest a strong focus on personal and communal well-being in the context of tourism.
1440 – **Experience and Behavior:** The presence of terms such as *experience*, *experiences*, *behavior*,
1441 and *behavioral intentions* indicates an emphasis on how individuals experience tourism and the
1442 resulting behaviors.
1443 – **Management and Service:** Words like *management*, *service quality*, *performance*, and *customer satisfaction*
1444 highlight the operational and strategic side of tourism studies.
1445 – **Sustainability and Community:** Terms such as *sustainable tourism*, *community*, *residents*,
1446 *destination*, and *conservation* reflect the growing attention on environmental and social sustainability
1447 within the industry.
1448 – **Methodological and Theoretical Constructs:** Other recurring words such as *model*, *scale*,
1449 *pls-sem*, and *framework* suggest the use of sophisticated methodological tools and theoretical
1450 frameworks in the literature.

1451 • **Distribution Characteristics:**

- 1452 – The frequency distribution is highly skewed—a small number of key terms appear with very
1453 high frequency, while many terms cluster near the lower threshold (5–10 occurrences). This
1454 pattern is typical of bibliometric data and reflects the influence of Zipf's law in language.

1455 **Interpretation**

1456 • **Central Themes:**

- 1457 – **Quality and Well-Being:** The very high frequency of terms related to quality-of-life and sat-
1458 isfaction indicates that these concepts are the backbone of research in tourism and hospitality.
1459 Scholars are deeply invested in understanding how tourism affects personal and community
1460 well-being.
1461 – **Experiential and Behavioral Dimensions:** Frequent use of terms such as *experience*, *behav-
1462 ioral intentions*, and *perceptions* underlines the importance of understanding both the subjective
1463 experiences of tourists and their subsequent behaviors.

- 1464 – **Operational Focus:** Keywords such as management, service quality, and performance point
1465 to an emphasis on practical applications in tourism management, including improving service
1466 delivery and operational efficiency.
1467 – **Sustainability and Social Impact:** The appearance of sustainability-related terms (e.g., sus-
1468 tainable tourism, conservation, community participation) shows that environmental, social, and
1469 economic sustainability are critical issues being addressed in the field.

1470 • **Methodological Insights:**

- 1471 – The presence of technical terms such as model, scale, and pls-sem suggests that advanced sta-
1472 tistical and modeling techniques are widely applied in tourism research.
1473 – The spread of terms related to both qualitative (e.g., grounded theory, narratives) and quanti-
1474 tative (e.g., structural model, panel-data) methods indicates a mixed-methods approach in the
1475 literature.

1476 • **Implications for the Research Field:**

- 1477 – The strong emphasis on quality-of-life, satisfaction, and experiential aspects implies that
1478 tourism research is not only concerned with economic outcomes but also with the social and
1479 psychological impacts of tourism.
1480 – The diversity of terms also highlights the interdisciplinary nature of the field, intersecting mar-
1481 keting, psychology, management, and sustainability studies.

1482 **Conclusion & Summary**

1483 **Conclusion:**

1484 The word frequency analysis—our “word frequency spectroscopy”—reveals a dynamic and multifaceted re-
1485 search landscape. Central themes such as quality-of-life, satisfaction, and tourism experiences dominate the
1486 discourse, while a variety of supporting concepts (e.g., service quality, sustainability, behavioral intentions)
1487 underscore the field’s complexity and interdisciplinarity.


1488 **Summary:**

1489 - **Pattern:**

- 1490 - A few key terms appear very frequently, establishing the core focus of the literature. - The distribution
1491 follows a typical skewed pattern, with many terms clustering at lower frequencies. - **Interpretation:**
1492 - The prominence of well-being, experiential, and operational keywords signals that the field values both the
1493 subjective and objective aspects of tourism. - The methodological terms indicate robust, diverse approaches
1494 to researching these topics. - **Overall Insight:**
1495 - This “spectroscopy” of word frequencies helps identify the central pillars of the literature and guides
1496 researchers toward understanding the foundational themes, emerging trends, and interdisciplinary nature of
1497 tourism research.

1498 By understanding these patterns, scholars and practitioners can better appreciate the evolution, current focus,
1499 and potential future directions of research in tourism and hospitality.

Words	Occurrences
quality-of-life	371
satisfaction	326
tourism	294
happiness	219
perceptions	204
attitudes	189
impact	177
experience	150
health	147
model	144
experiences	134
support	108
behavior	100
travel	99
impacts	96
leisure	86
quality	80
benefits	78
management	76
performance	74
destination	73
community	72
life	70
motivation	68
vacation	66
hospitality	60
participation	59
place attachment	56
antecedents	50
behavioral intentions	50
involvement	50
work	49
authenticity	48
emotions	47
motivations	45
service quality	44
tourism development	42
positive psychology	41
sustainable tourism	41
loyalty	40
consumption	39
image	39
life satisfaction	39
scale	39
social impacts	39 ⁷⁷
framework	37
attachment	36
customer satisfaction	36



1500



1501



1503 Words' Frequency over Time

1504 The provided table offers a bibliometric analysis of the frequency of specific words related to the topic over
 1505 a span of two decades.

1506 Description

- 1507 • General Upward Trend:

1508 Across all key terms, there is a clear and steady increase in frequency over time. Starting from
 1509 minimal occurrences in the early 2000s (with many zeros in 2001–2002), the numbers gradually
 1510 climb with notable acceleration in later years.

- 1511 • Term-Specific Observations:

- 1512 – Quality-of-life:

1513 Initially absent or very low in frequency, this term shows exponential growth—rising to 371
 1514 occurrences by 2025.

- 1515 – Satisfaction and Tourism:

1516 Both terms follow a similar upward trend, indicating sustained and growing interest in these
 1517 aspects.

- 1518 – Happiness and Perceptions:

1519 These terms start at modest levels but also experience significant increases, reflecting the grow-
 1520 ing focus on emotional and cognitive dimensions within tourism research.

- 1521 – Attitudes and Impact:

1522 The steady rise in these terms suggests that researchers increasingly consider how tourism in-
 1523 fluences both attitudes and measurable impacts.

1524 – **Experience, Health, and Model:**

1525 Although starting lower compared to other terms, the frequency of these words also increases,
1526 underscoring an expanding emphasis on experiential, health-related, and methodological dimen-
1527 sions.

1528 • **Notable Increases:**

1529 A marked increase is visible from 2012 onward, likely reflecting an expanding body of research and
1530 the maturation of the field, where more nuanced aspects (such as health, models, and experiential
1531 quality) are examined.

1532 **Interpretation**

1533 • **Emerging and Evolving Themes:**

1534 The upward trajectory across all key terms indicates a growth in both the quantity and depth of re-
1535 search within the domain.

1536 – *Quality-of-life* and *satisfaction*—core to understanding the impacts of tourism—have become
1537 focal points, reflecting a shift toward evaluating tourism's effects on personal and community
1538 well-being.

1539 – The rise in *tourism* itself signals the overall expansion of the field.

1540 – Increased attention to *happiness*, *perceptions*, and *attitudes* suggests that the subjective experi-
1541 ences of tourists and residents are receiving more scholarly attention.

1542 – The growth in the frequency of *model* and related methodological terms highlights the increasing
1543 use of sophisticated analytical and statistical methods (e.g., structural equation modeling, pls-
1544 sem) to study these phenomena.

1545 • **Maturation of Research:**

1546 The consistent increase in these key words over time suggests that the field has matured. Early stud-
1547 ies laid the foundation, and later research builds on these seminal works to explore more complex,
1548 multidimensional issues.

1549 • **Reflecting Broader Trends:**

1550 The rise in terms like *quality-of-life*, *health*, and *experience* can be linked to broader societal trends
1551 —such as a focus on well-being, lifestyle, and the holistic impacts of tourism. Similarly, the use of
1552 methodological terms indicates that researchers are continuously improving the rigor and robustness
1553 of their analyses.

1554 **Conclusion & Summary**

1555 **Conclusion:**

1556 The time-series data of word frequencies clearly illustrate the evolution of research themes in the tourism
1557 domain. As the field grows, core themes such as quality-of-life, satisfaction, and tourism have seen substan-
1558 tial increases in their usage. This not only reflects a quantitative growth in publications but also indicates
1559 a qualitative shift toward more comprehensive, multidisciplinary inquiries into the effects and implications
1560 of tourism.

1561 **Summary:**

1562 - **Pattern:**


Year	QUALITY-OF-LIFE	SATISFACTION	TOURISM	HAPPINESS	PERCEPTIONS	ATTITUDES	INFLUENCE
2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2003	2	0	1	0	0	1	1
2004	3	1	1	1	0	1	1
2005	3	1	1	1	0	1	1
2006	4	1	2	1	0	2	2
2007	4	1	3	1	0	2	2
2008	5	1	6	1	0	3	3
2009	5	1	8	1	0	4	4
2010	6	1	10	1	0	5	5
2011	6	1	10	1	0	6	6
2012	8	2	15	3	3	7	7
2013	13	6	20	5	7	10	10
2014	19	12	25	10	11	10	10
2015	26	15	31	15	15	14	14
2016	44	29	40	22	27	22	22
2017	69	44	48	35	36	36	36
2018	84	62	58	45	47	45	45
2019	111	87	75	59	63	57	57
2020	146	118	98	78	85	73	73
2021	188	150	128	100	111	96	96
2022	230	187	165	131	128	124	124
2023	286	243	216	158	159	150	150
2024	360	319	286	215	201	186	186
2025	371	326	294	219	204	189	189

¹⁵⁶³ - There is an overall upward trend in the frequency of all key terms from 2001 to 2025. - Early years show
¹⁵⁶⁴ very low frequencies, while later years demonstrate robust usage of terms. - **Interpretation:**

¹⁵⁶⁵ - The increasing frequencies of terms like quality-of-life, satisfaction, tourism, and happiness suggest that
¹⁵⁶⁶ these are central, evolving themes in the literature. - The growth in methodological and conceptual terms
¹⁵⁶⁷ (e.g., model, experience) indicates an evolution toward more sophisticated research designs. - **Overall In-**
¹⁵⁶⁸ **sight:**

¹⁵⁶⁹ - The data serve as a “spectroscopic” fingerprint of the field, revealing how foundational themes have grown
¹⁵⁷⁰ and diversified over time. This evolution reflects both the expansion of tourism research and its increas-
¹⁵⁷¹ ing complexity, aligning with broader trends in societal focus on well-being, sustainability, and consumer
¹⁵⁷² experience.

¹⁵⁷³ This analysis of word frequency over time provides valuable insights into how the research landscape has
¹⁵⁷⁴ developed and where future scholarly efforts may be directed.



1575

Trend Topics

Description

- **Wide Range of Topics:**

The topics span from highly researched themes like *quality-of-life*, *satisfaction*, and *tourism* to more niche areas such as *casino*, *connectedness*, and *social media*.

- **Temporal Distribution:**

- **Earlier Appearance:** Some topics, like *mood* and *patterns*, show initial prominence around 2012–2013 with later median and Q3 years indicating continued relevance.

- **Later Emergence:** Key topics such as *quality-of-life*, *perceptions*, *attitudes*, *satisfaction*, *tourism*, and *happiness* have Q1 values around 2019–2020, with median and Q3 values extending to 2022–2024. This suggests these themes have become central and are driving recent research.

- **Steady Themes:** Other topics (e.g., *leisure*, *vacation*, *social impacts*) show a steady upward trend with their central tendency positioned in recent years.

- **Frequency Variation:**

- High-frequency topics (e.g., *quality-of-life* with 371 occurrences and *satisfaction* with 326) indicate major research drivers.

- Lower-frequency topics (e.g., *casino* with 5 occurrences) may represent more specialized or emerging areas.

Interpretation

1596 • **Evolving Research Priorities:**

1597 The shift in the median and Q3 years toward the later part of the timeline for many key topics (such as
1598 *quality-of-life, satisfaction, tourism, and happiness*) suggests that the field has increasingly focused
1599 on the holistic and experiential aspects of tourism and its broader social and emotional impacts.

1600 • **Emergence of New Areas:**

1601 Terms like *social media* and *connectedness* appear in the most recent quartiles, reflecting the impact
1602 of digital technologies and social networks on tourism research. Similarly, *technology* as a topic,
1603 though lower in frequency, is gaining traction in the later years.

1604 • **Consistent Themes:**

1605 Core topics such as *leisure, vacation, and travel* have maintained consistent attention over the years,
1606 which indicates their foundational role in the research field. Their consistent appearance underscores
1607 the importance of understanding both the operational and experiential dimensions of tourism.

1608 • **Implications for Future Research:**

1609 The data suggest that while traditional topics remain critical, there is a growing interest in integrating
1610 digital and social dimensions (e.g., *social media, connectedness*) and exploring new angles on well-
1611 being (*quality-of-life, self-determination*) within the context of tourism and hospitality.

1612 Conclusion & Summary

1613 Conclusion:

1614 The trend topics analysis reveals a clear evolution in research focus over the years. Traditional themes such
1615 as *quality-of-life, satisfaction, tourism, and happiness* have surged in importance in recent years, while
1616 emerging areas such as *social media* and *connectedness* signal the integration of digital dimensions into
1617 tourism research.

1618 Summary:


1619 - Pattern:

1620 - Many key terms have shifted toward later publication years, with medians and Q3 values in the 2020–
1621 2024 range. - High-frequency topics such as *quality-of-life, satisfaction, and tourism* dominate the recent
1622 landscape. - Interpretation:

1623 - The data indicate an evolving research focus from traditional tourism metrics to broader, more holistic
1624 measures of well-being and digital influence. - The steady rise of topics like *leisure* and *vacation* reinforces
1625 their enduring relevance. - Overall Insight:

1626 - The trend topics provide a “spectral” view of the field, highlighting both well-established and emerging
1627 themes. This evolution reflects the dynamic nature of tourism research as it adapts to societal changes,
1628 technological advancements, and new methodological approaches.

Term	Frequency	Year.(Q1)	Year.(Median)	Year.(Q3)
mood	12	2012	2014	2020
casino	5	2014	2014	2018
patterns	12	2013	2015	2020
holiday	7	2014	2015	2020
issues	21	2015	2016	2019
vacations	8	2016	2016	2020
goals	5	2014	2017	2021
long-run	5	2016	2017	2020
segmentation	14	2016	2018	2023
cycle	13	2015	2018	2020
travel experiences	10	2016	2018	2023
host perceptions	28	2017	2019	2022
indicators	15	2016	2019	2023
self-determination	9	2018	2019	2021
leisure	86	2016	2020	2022
vacation	66	2017	2020	2023
social impacts	39	2016	2020	2022
quality-of-life	371	2019	2021	2023
perceptions	204	2019	2021	2023
attitudes	189	2019	2021	2023
satisfaction	326	2019	2022	2024
tourism	294	2019	2022	2024
happiness	219	2019	2022	2024
impact	177	2020	2023	2024
travel	99	2020	2023	2024
hospitality	60	2021	2023	2024
technology	18	2020	2024	2024
social media	16	2022	2024	2024
connectedness	10	2023	2024	2024



1630 **Clustering**

1631 **Clustering by Coupling**

1632 Bibliometric coupling occurs when two documents reference a common third document in their bibliographies.
1633 It's a method used to understand and visualize the intellectual structure of a scientific field.

1634 • Table1 Parameters:

- 1635 – Analysis of Documents using the CR (Cited References) field.
- 1636 – The analysis uses a single word (ngram = 1) as a term.
- 1637 – The labeling term used is 'ID'.
- 1638 – The impact measure is local, meaning the citation scores are specific to this dataset and do not refer to global scores.
- 1639 – Stemming is set to false, which means words in their base form were not merged (e.g., 'running', 'runner', and 'ran' are treated as distinct words).
- 1640 – The size of 0.3 might refer to the size of the nodes or clusters in a visualization (if one exists).
- 1641 – Community repulsion and repel are both set to zero or false, which means there is no repulsion force in the clustering process. This could have implications for the layout of a network visualization.
- 1642 – Walktrap is the clustering method used. Walktrap is a method that identifies communities (or clusters) in networks by simulating random walks.

1648 **Description**

- 1649 • These parameters tell us that the bibliocoupling analysis focused on a set of 250 documents. Only references cited at least 7 times were considered, and the local citation impact was used to weigh the coupling. The walktrap clustering algorithm was chosen to detect communities (clusters) among documents.
- 1653 • All the documents in Table 2 are assigned to Cluster 1, indicating that—under the chosen coupling criteria—they share a similar citation footprint. The NormalizedLocalCitationScore gives an idea of each document's local impact within this cluster. Higher scores (for example, above 5) may indicate that these works are central in this group, while lower scores indicate a more peripheral position.
- 1657 • The labels are created by extracting key words that most frequently appear within the coupled documents. For instance, in Cluster 1 the dominant topics appear to be "quality-of-life," "satisfaction," and "perceptions." The "conf" values (for "confidence") indicate the proportion with which these words characterize the cluster. In Cluster 2, terms such as "satisfaction," "tourism," and "happiness" define the group. The frequency (number of documents or occurrences), centrality (how central this cluster is within the network), and impact (aggregate local impact) help to compare the importance of each cluster. The color codes can be used to visually distinguish clusters in network visualizations.

1664 **Interpretation**

- 1665 • Cluster Formation:

1666 – The bibliocoupling analysis shows that a large portion of the 250 documents (as seen in Table
1667 2) belong to a single dominant cluster (Cluster 1), suggesting a high degree of shared references
1668 among these works. The cluster is characterized by themes related to quality-of-life, satisfaction,
1669 and perceptions—a reflection of a common intellectual basis in tourism and hospitality research.

1670 • Cluster Labels and Themes:

1671 – Table 3 provides a “spectral” overview of clusters by summarizing the key themes. Different
1672 clusters (here, four groups are shown) have distinctive profiles:



1673 • Groups

1674 – Group 1: Emphasizes quality-of-life, satisfaction, and perceptions.
1675 – Group 2: Highlights satisfaction, tourism, and happiness.
1676 – Group 3: Focuses on tourism as well as quality-of-life and satisfaction (but with a different
1677 balance).
1678 – Group 4: Indicates a blend where quality-of-life and happiness are important alongside satisfac-
1679 tion.

1680 • Application: Such an analysis can help researchers identify the intellectual foundations of the field,
1681 pinpoint seminal works, and recognize the evolution of research topics over time. It also facilitates
1682 the discovery of potential gaps, emerging clusters, or the need for interdisciplinary bridges.

1683 **Conclusion & Summary**

1684 In summary, this bibliocoupling analysis—through document clustering—provides a detailed “map” of how
1685 research in tourism, quality-of-life, satisfaction, and related fields is interconnected. The parameters (Table
1686 1) set the stage for the analysis, Table 2 shows the membership and impact of individual works within a
1687 cluster, and Table 3 synthesizes the thematic essence of each cluster, offering insights into the structure and
1688 evolution of the research landscape.



1690

1691 Conceptual Structure**1692 Network Approach****1693 Co-occurrence Network****1694 Description**

1695 • Cluster 1:

- 1696 – Includes keywords such as quality-of-life, satisfaction, perceptions, attitudes, impact, support,
1697 management, destination, community, and so forth. These terms emphasize conceptual and
1698 socio-psychological aspects of tourism research (e.g., quality-of-life outcomes, satisfaction con-
1699 structs, community support, and destination management).

1700 • Cluster 2:

- 1701 – Includes keywords such as tourism, happiness, experience, health, behavior, travel, leisure, mo-
1702 tivation, vacation, hospitality, emotions, service quality, etc.

- 1703 • These terms tend to focus on traveler-centric topics such as tourist behavior, happiness, well-being,
1704 and experiential dimensions of tourism and hospitality.

- 1705 • Each node is measured by three main centrality metrics:

- 1706 – Betweenness: How often a keyword lies on the shortest path between two other keywords. High
1707 betweenness = strong “bridging” or “brokerage” role.
1708 – Closeness: How close a keyword is to all other keywords in the network. High closeness = the
1709 keyword can quickly “reach” many others.
1710 – PageRank: A measure of overall importance or influence in the network. High PageRank = a
1711 keyword is frequently linked or co-occurs with other influential terms.

1712 Interpretation

1713 1. Cluster 1 Highlights

1714 • Quality-of-life (Betweenness = 71.51, PageRank = 0.0720)

- 1715 – This has the highest betweenness and highest PageRank in the entire network, indicating it is a
1716 major “bridge” and a core concept.
1717 – High betweenness means quality-of-life connects multiple subtopics, bridging them within
1718 tourism research.
1719 – High PageRank underscores its frequent and influential co-occurrences with other key words
1720 like satisfaction, perceptions, and attitudes.

1721 • Satisfaction (Betweenness = 61.36, PageRank = 0.0684)

- 1722 – Another highly central term, signifying it often co-occurs with quality-of-life and perceptions.
1723 – Its role in bridging subtopics is second only to quality-of-life, reflecting the strong interplay
1724 between satisfaction constructs and broader tourism impacts.

- Perceptions (Betweenness = 22.47, PageRank = 0.0441) and Attitudes (Betweenness = 19.09, PageRank = 0.0420)
 - Both show moderate to high betweenness and are conceptually linked to how stakeholders (e.g., residents, tourists) perceive tourism's impacts and outcomes.
 - They often appear in studies focusing on local community or tourist viewpoints.
- Impact / Impacts (Betweenness ~16, PageRank ~0.03)
 - Reiterates the thematic emphasis on understanding how tourism affects communities, well-being, and destination development.
- In sum, Cluster 1 focuses on macro-level and conceptual themes such as quality-of-life, satisfaction, and stakeholder perceptions. The high bridging role of quality-of-life and satisfaction suggests these are pivotal, unifying concepts in tourism research.

2. Cluster 2 Highlights

- Tourism (Betweenness = 29.29, PageRank = 0.0445) and Happiness (Betweenness = 28.09, PageRank = 0.0453)
 - These have the highest betweenness in Cluster 2, indicating they frequently link subtopics related to personal well-being, experiences, and behavior.
- Experience / Experiences (Betweenness ~14, PageRank ~0.0317) and Health (Betweenness ~8.62, PageRank ~0.0292)
 - Emphasize the experiential and well-being dimensions of tourism.
 - Experience is a core bridging term for traveler-centric research, while health underscores the growing interest in wellness, mental health, and stress recovery.
- Behavior (Betweenness = 5.54, PageRank = 0.0224), Travel (Betweenness = 3.64, PageRank = 0.0202), Leisure (Betweenness = 3.37, PageRank = 0.0205)
 - Reflect the micro-level, individual consumer or traveler perspective—motivation, behavior, and leisure patterns.
- Hospitality, Service Quality, Loyalty, Customer Satisfaction
 - These terms highlight the hospitality management dimension within tourism, focusing on how service experiences influence consumer loyalty and satisfaction.
- Overall, Cluster 2 is more oriented toward traveler well-being, emotions, experiences, and behavioral outcomes (e.g., loyalty, motivation, and health benefits). Tourism and happiness stand out as bridging concepts linking different aspects of the tourist experience and personal well-being.

Conclusion & Summary

1. Two Thematic Cores:
 - Cluster 1: Macro-level constructs—quality-of-life, satisfaction, and perceptions—dominate. They connect strongly with impacts, community, management, and destination themes.

- 1760 • Cluster 2: Micro-level or traveler-centric themes—tourism, happiness, experience, health, and be-
1761 havior—are central, highlighting well-being, motivation, leisure, and service quality.

1762 2. Most Influential Terms:

- 1763 • Quality-of-life leads in betweenness and PageRank, serving as a key integrative concept bridging
1764 other themes.
1765 • Satisfaction, tourism, and happiness also show high centrality, indicating they frequently co-occur
1766 with many keywords and serve as important nodes in the network.

1767 3. Conceptual Bridge:

- 1768 • The co-word network shows that quality-of-life (Cluster 1) and tourism / happiness (Cluster 2) are ma-
1769 jor “bridges,” connecting socio-psychological aspects (perceptions, attitudes, impacts) with personal
1770 experience dimensions (health, motivation, leisure).


1771 4. Practical Implication:

- 1772 • Researchers focusing on policy and strategic planning may gravitate toward Cluster 1 concepts (e.g.,
1773 quality-of-life, satisfaction, community impacts).
1774 • Scholars exploring traveler behavior, well-being, and experiential marketing will likely anchor in
1775 Cluster 2 (tourism, happiness, experience, health).

1776 • Conclusion:

- 1777 – The co-word network reveals two robust thematic poles in tourism research: one anchored in
1778 quality-of-life and satisfaction at the macro/community level, and the other in tourism, happi-
1779 ness, and health at the traveler experience level. High-betweenness terms (e.g., quality-of-life,
1780 satisfaction, tourism, happiness) serve as critical links across subfields, indicating these key-
1781 words are central to the ongoing dialogue in tourism and hospitality scholarship.

Node	Cluster	Betweenness	Closeness	PageRank
quality-of-life	1	71.50555996	0.01923077	0.072007839
satisfaction	1	61.36116652	0.01960784	0.068423056
perceptions	1	22.47400947	0.01960784	0.044104102
attitudes	1	19.09051419	0.01886792	0.041976122
impact	1	16.09042793	0.01923077	0.033421084
model	1	14.70315216	0.02040816	0.031379442
support	1	5.28881256	0.01639344	0.027270317
impacts	1	1.98943940	0.01492537	0.020753606
management	1	1.21270369	0.01538462	0.013463103
performance	1	2.71185040	0.01724138	0.014511253
destination	1	2.69455667	0.01724138	0.016888536
community	1	2.77949035	0.01639344	0.017234390
participation	1	1.41306468	0.01612903	0.013342324
place attachment	1	1.96921720	0.01639344	0.016049657
tourism development	1	0.15064032	0.01298701	0.009730973
sustainable tourism	1	0.37027872	0.01333333	0.010818812
image	1	1.10824682	0.01587302	0.011375787
social impacts	1	0.58149154	0.01351351	0.010346093
framework	1	0.51975513	0.01492537	0.009322623
attachment	1	0.47362180	0.01388889	0.010328885
residents perceptions	1	0.09939396	0.01234568	0.009114786
identity	1	0.47761152	0.01470588	0.008931140
tourism	2	29.29428826	0.01960784	0.044456950
happiness	2	28.09026661	0.01960784	0.045319054
experience	2	13.94918967	0.01886792	0.031701368
health	2	8.62428021	0.01851852	0.029196663
experiences	2	4.94560860	0.01785714	0.023920834
behavior	2	5.53508888	0.01851852	0.022410710
travel	2	3.63723052	0.01754386	0.020176020
leisure	2	3.37247458	0.01666667	0.020520597
quality	2	3.83654392	0.01724138	0.018553080
benefits	2	1.84968372	0.01639344	0.017138772
life	2	1.21081475	0.01562500	0.014353467
motivation	2	1.60064297	0.01612903	0.015277252
vacation	2	1.65098250	0.01538462	0.017071013
hospitality	2	0.69101276	0.01492537	0.011972105
antecedents	2	1.45442394	0.01587302	0.013401872
behavioral intentions	2	1.54899142	0.01562500	0.014920073
involvement	2	0.71617880	0.01515152	0.012721996
work	2	0.52799138	0.01428571	0.011183457
authenticity	2	0.41854427	0.01492537	0.010309238
emotions	2	2.37330038	0.01666667	0.013940212
motivations	2	0.24362944	0.01351351	0.009674260
service quality	2	0.86218217	0.01449275	0.011370385
positive psychology	2	0.17645801	0.01388889	0.009743053 ⁹²
loyalty	2	0.80103942	0.01492537	0.012104113
consumption	2	0.23035039	0.01369863	0.008721654
life satisfaction	2	0.53725025	0.01449275	0.008854840



1782

1783 Thematic Map

1784 Based on the provided data, it appears to be a bibliometric analysis of the term. Bibliometric analysis is
 1785 used to quantify and analyze published literature on a particular topic, often to identify the most prevalent
 1786 themes, authors, and journals. The data seems to be organized in a thematic map, detailing the occurrences
 1787 and relevance of certain words or terms associated with the topic.

1788 Description

1789 The Thematic Map positions each cluster according to two metrics:

1790 **Callon Centrality:** How important or “central” a cluster is to the entire research domain. High centrality
 1791 indicates the cluster is well-connected and influences many other themes. **Callon Density:** How internally
 1792 cohesive or “dense” a cluster is. High density indicates the cluster’s themes are well-developed and strongly
 1793 interconnected. Additionally, the bubble size corresponds to the frequency of topics within that cluster (i.e.,
 1794 how often these topics appear in the dataset).

1795 From the table:

Cluster	Callon Centrality	Callon Density	Rank Centrality	Rank Density	Frequency
Health	2.91	13.25	3	4	1932
Satisfaction	5.24	10.38	4	2	3244
Perceptions	1.99	10.76	2	3	1461
Quality-of-Life	1.78	9.51	1	1	866

- 1796 • Cluster 1: Health has high density (13.25) but moderate centrality (2.91).
- 1797 • Cluster 2: Satisfaction stands out for having the highest centrality (5.24) and a relatively high density (10.38).
- 1798 • Cluster 3: Perceptions shows moderate centrality (1.99) and density (10.76).
- 1799 • Cluster 4: Quality-of-Life has lower centrality (1.78) and density (9.51), as well as the smallest frequency (866).

1800 Interpretation

1801 1. Health

- 1802 • Density (13.25): Indicates a well-developed, cohesive set of themes.
- 1803 • Centrality (2.91): The cluster is moderately influential within the overall research landscape.
- 1804 • Frequency (1932): There is a substantial volume of research, covering:
 - 1805 – Well-being, mental health, stress, physical activity, wellness tourism, and vacation benefits.
 - 1806 – Topics such as positive psychology, life satisfaction, stress, self-determination, and burnout frequently appear.
- 1807 • Interpretation: Although not the most central cluster, “Health” is deeply explored and internally co-hesive. It serves as a significant subfield, possibly appealing to scholars studying tourism’s role in 1808 stress reduction, wellness experiences, and overall well-being.

1809 2. Satisfaction

- 1810 • Density (10.38): Well-developed but not as dense as “Health.”
- 1811 • Centrality (5.24): The highest among all clusters, indicating it is a key bridging concept for the entire 1812 domain.
- 1813 • Frequency (3244): The largest volume of research. Core themes include:
 - 1814 – Consumer behavior, service quality, tourism experience, loyalty, behavioral intentions, motivation, and hospitality management.
 - 1815 – The presence of strong “experience” and “modeling” keywords indicates robust quantitative 1816 and conceptual frameworks analyzing satisfaction-related outcomes.
- 1817 • Interpretation: “Satisfaction” is pivotal to the domain. It connects to many other themes (e.g., loyalty, 1818 experience, perceived value), making it a central hub in tourism and hospitality research.

1819 3. Perceptions

- 1820 • Density (10.76): Similar to “Satisfaction” in density, indicating strong internal links.
- 1821 • Centrality (1.99): Somewhat lower centrality compared to “Satisfaction,” but not marginal.
- 1822 • Frequency (1461): Moderately sized. Key themes:
 - 1823 – Attitudes, community perceptions, residents’ support, sustainable tourism, social impacts, and management aspects.
 - 1824 – Emphasis on how locals, communities, and stakeholders perceive tourism’s impacts.

- 1831 • Interpretation: “Perceptions” focuses on stakeholder attitudes (especially residents), community-
1832 level impacts, and sustainability. Its moderate centrality suggests it is more specialized than “Sat-
1833 isfaction” but remains an important dimension of tourism research.


1834 4. Quality-of-Life

- 1835 • Density (9.51): The lowest density, indicating it is less internally cohesive compared to the others.
1836 • Centrality (1.78): Also relatively low, meaning it is less connected to other clusters.
1837 • Frequency (866): The smallest cluster, yet thematically crucial. Key topics:
1838 – Socio-economic impacts, well-being research, policy aspects, urban tourism, and city contexts.
1839 – Terms like “heritage,” “choice,” “innovation,” and “rural tourism” appear, suggesting a broad
1840 range but less internal overlap.
1841 • Interpretation: “Quality-of-Life” is foundational to tourism’s broader socio-economic discourse, link-
1842 ing well-being to policy and development. Despite lower centrality and density, it remains a concep-
1843 tually important area, especially for strategic and policy-driven studies.

1844 Conclusion & Summary

- 1845 • Health (high density, moderate centrality): A strongly developed cluster focusing on well-being,
1846 mental health, stress, and physical activity in tourism contexts.
1847 • Satisfaction (highest centrality, well-developed density): The dominant cluster bridging various sub-
1848 fields in tourism and hospitality—centered on consumer satisfaction, loyalty, and experience.
1849 • Perceptions (moderate centrality, moderate-high density): Focused on stakeholder attitudes, commu-
1850 nity impacts, and sustainability. Emphasizes how local communities and other stakeholders perceive
1851 tourism’s effects.
1852 • Quality-of-Life (lowest centrality and density, smaller size): Addresses broader socio-economic out-
1853 comes, well-being research, and policy concerns, providing a more macro-level perspective on how
1854 tourism influences overall life quality.
1855 • The Satisfaction cluster emerges as the most central—meaning it touches many other areas of tourism
1856 research—while Health is the most internally cohesive (highest density). Perceptions occupies a mid-
1857 range position, suggesting it is well-studied but less of a “bridge” than Satisfaction. Quality-of-Life
1858 appears more specialized, with fewer interconnections but important for strategic policy insights.
1859 • The thematic analysis reveals four major research clusters in the field: Health, Satisfaction, Percep-
1860 tions, and Quality-of-Life.
1861 • Satisfaction is the key bridging concept in tourism and hospitality studies, connecting with consumer
1862 behavior, loyalty, service quality, and experience-driven research.
1863 • Health is a well-established, highly cohesive cluster focusing on wellness and well-being, indicating
1864 a strong niche of scholarship.
1865 • Perceptions revolve around how stakeholders and communities view tourism, highlighting attitudes,
1866 community support, and sustainable tourism.
1867 • Quality-of-Life stands out for exploring policy, socio-economic, and macro-level impacts, though it
1868 is less interconnected with other clusters.
1869 • Overall, these four clusters collectively structure the tourism and hospitality research landscape, re-
1870 flecting both micro-level topics (e.g., satisfaction, well-being) and macro-level considerations (e.g.,
1871 community perceptions, quality-of-life, policy). Future research may benefit from integrating these

1872 clusters, for instance, examining how quality-of-life outcomes tie into satisfaction drivers, or how 1873 community perceptions intersect with health-related tourism experiences.



1875 Factorial Approach**1876 Factorial Analysis**

1877 Factorial analysis is a statistical method used to identify the underlying relationships among a set of variables.
1878 Here, you've presented data for words (probably representing research themes or keywords) and
1879 documents (probably representing research papers) in two different dimensions (Dim.1 and Dim.2).

1880 Description

- 1881 • In our dataset, 50+ keywords (e.g., "quality.of.life", "satisfaction", "tourism", "happiness", "percep-
1882 tions", etc.) were subjected to a factor analysis. Two factors (here labeled Dim1 and Dim2) emerged
1883 that account for a major part of the variance in the keywords' co-occurrence patterns. For example:
 - 1884 – Quality.of.life shows a strong negative loading on Dim1 (-0.85) and near zero on Dim2.
 - 1885 – Attitudes and perceptions both load very negatively on Dim1 (-1.63 and -1.15, respectively),
1886 while other terms such as support (-1.86) and sustainable.tourism (-1.87) are also strongly neg-
1887 ative on Dim1.
 - 1888 – In contrast, words such as vacation (1.05 on Dim1 and 1.16 on Dim2), health (0.81, 0.87), leisure
1889 (0.81, 0.97) and life (0.96, 0.17) show strong positive values—especially on Dim1.
 - 1890 – Some terms are more prominent on Dim2: for example, happiness (0.47, 0.58) and experiences
1891 (0.5, 0.69) suggest an important emotional/experiential component.
- 1892 • Each keyword's coordinates on these two dimensions is thought to reflect underlying "latent" factors
1893 in how topics are discussed in the literature.

1894 Interpretation

1895 Although interpretation in factor analysis can be somewhat subjective, the pattern of loadings suggests the
1896 following:


- 1897 • Dimension 1: "Value & Appraisal versus Critical/Contextual Factors"
 - 1898 – High positive loadings (e.g., "vacation," "life," "health," "leisure") indicate terms that are typi-
1899 cally associated with positive experiential outcomes and well-being.
 - 1900 – High negative loadings (e.g., "perceptions," "attitudes," "support," "sustainable.tourism") indi-
1901 cate concepts that may capture evaluative or critical aspects (for example, community or stake-
1902 holder concerns, or constructs that question the status quo).
 - 1903 – In essence, Dim1 appears to differentiate research that emphasizes the positive, beneficial, or
1904 "value-adding" aspects of tourism from work that focuses on critical or challenging perspec-
1905 tives (or even on the underlying cognitive-affective appraisals of tourism impacts).
- 1906 • Dimension 2: "Emotional-Experiential Intensity versus Structural/Process Aspects"
 - 1907 – Higher scores on Dim2 (e.g., "happiness," "experiences," "leisure," "benefits") suggest a focus
1908 on the intensity of affect, emotion, or subjective experience.
 - 1909 – In contrast, keywords such as "model," "service.quality," "behavioral.intentions," and
1910 "loyalty"—which load more strongly in the negative direction on Dim2—may be more
1911 concerned with evaluative, outcome-oriented, or structural aspects of tourism research.

- 1912 – Thus, Dim2 can be seen as contrasting research that emphasizes the affective, emotional, and
1913 experiential side of tourism versus work that is more about measurement models, process eval-
1914 uations, and outcome indicators.


1915 **Conclusion & Summary**

- 1916 • Two key dimensions emerged from the factor analysis on tourism-related keywords.
- 1917 – Dimension 1 appears to capture a continuum from positive experiential and well-being aspects
1918 (e.g., “vacation,” “health,” “leisure,” “life”) to more evaluative or critical constructs (e.g., “atti-
1919 tudes,” “perceptions,” “support,” “sustainable.tourism”).
- 1920 – Dimension 2 seems to distinguish between emotionally charged, experiential concepts (e.g.,
1921 “happiness,” “experiences”) and those keywords that are more process□ or model-oriented (e.g.,
1922 “model,” “behavioral.intentions,” “service.quality”).
- 1923 – All keywords included in this analysis were part of a single cluster (Cluster 1), indicating that
1924 while there is one overall thematic grouping in the literature, two latent dimensions underlie
1925 how these themes interrelate.
- 1926 • Conclusion:
- 1927 – The factor analysis reveals that within tourism research the scholarly discourse can be under-
1928 stood along two interrelated axes. One axis (Dim1) differentiates between constructs related to
1929 positive outcomes and quality of life versus those that reflect critical perceptions and contextual
1930 challenges. The other axis (Dim2) highlights the distinction between the intensity of emotional
1931 and experiential aspects and more structural, model-based, or outcome-focused measures.
- 1932 – This dual□dimensional structure underscores the multifaceted nature of tourism research. Re-
1933 searchers and practitioners can use these insights to:
- 1934 * Better understand which concepts are central to different research traditions (e.g., studies
1935 of well-being versus evaluations of tourism impacts).
- 1936 * Guide future investigations by clarifying which aspects (emotional vs. structural, positive
1937 vs. critical) remain underexplored or in need of deeper theoretical integration.
- 1938 * Inform policy and management decisions by recognizing that both subjective well-being
1939 and structural performance indicators are critical in evaluating the success and sustainabil-
1940 ity of tourism initiatives.

1941 In summary, the latent dimensions identified through the factor analysis provide a nuanced picture of how
1942 keywords cluster around themes of quality-of-life and satisfaction, while also highlighting the role of emo-
1943 tional experience versus evaluative modeling in tourism research. This enhanced understanding can help
1944 orient future research and interdisciplinary dialogue within the field.



1945



1946

1947 Intellectual Structure**1948 Co-citation Network****1949 Description**

1950 Network Structure and Clusters:

- 1951 • Cluster 1: This group includes documents such as Mccabe et al. (2013), Gilbert (2004), Smith (2017),
1952 Sirgy (2011), and several others. These works generally have moderate to low betweenness values
1953 (e.g., betweenness ranging from about 0.3 to 8) and closeness values around 0.012–0.015. Their
1954 PageRank scores (ranging roughly from 0.01 to 0.03) indicate that while they are cited together and
1955 contribute to a cohesive group, they are not the highest “bridging” documents in the network.
- 1956 • Cluster 2: Starting with nodes such as Kim K (2013), Andereck KL (2011), Woo E (2015), and others,
1957 Cluster 2 documents show very high betweenness values (e.g., 14–15 and even up to 27 in some cases)
1958 and relatively high closeness (around 0.014–0.017). Their PageRank scores (up to 0.036) indicate
1959 that these documents play a key role in linking various subfields or subtopics. This cluster likely
1960 represents a group of seminal or central works that many later studies reference together.
- 1961 • Cluster 3: The third cluster (which begins with Fornell (1981) and includes Uysal (2016), Hair (2010),
1962 Podsakoff (2003), etc.) has very high betweenness values (for instance, Fornell’s betweenness is over
1963 130) and higher closeness values (around 0.017–0.019). Their PageRank scores are also higher (up
1964 to 0.03 or more). This cluster appears to capture highly influential and broadly recognized works that
1965 serve as intellectual hubs in the tourism literature.

1966 Centrality Measures:

- 1967 • Betweenness Centrality: This measure reflects how often a document lies on the shortest path be-
1968 tween other documents. Documents with high betweenness (e.g., those in Cluster 3) are considered
1969 “bridges” between different parts of the network, indicating they are crucial for connecting diverse
1970 research streams.
- 1971 • Closeness Centrality: This value shows how close a document is to all other documents in the network.
1972 Most documents have closeness values in the narrow range (~0.012–0.019), suggesting that while
1973 there are differences, the network is relatively compact.
- 1974 • PageRank: Higher PageRank values (e.g., those for some Cluster 3 documents) indicate that those pa-
1975 pers are not only well-cited but also cited by other well-cited documents, underlining their broader
1976 influence within the literature.

1977 Interpretation

- 1978 • Distinct Intellectual Communities: The emergence of three clusters indicates that the field of tourism
1979 research is divided into at least three distinct intellectual communities or subfields. Each cluster
1980 groups together articles that tend to be cited together, suggesting that they share common themes or
1981 theoretical frameworks.

- 1982 • Influence and Bridging Roles: Documents in Cluster 3 (with very high betweenness and PageRank)
1983 appear to serve as key bridges, likely representing foundational or methodological works that have
1984 influenced multiple strands of tourism research. In contrast, Cluster 1 documents may be more spe-
1985 cialized or represent a more coherent niche, while Cluster 2 contains influential works that are central
1986 to connecting topics within that niche.
- 1987 • Role of Seminal Works: For instance, Fornell's (1981) work in Cluster 3 has an exceptionally high
1988 betweenness centrality, marking it as a pivotal reference that links diverse research areas. Similarly,
1989 high betweenness scores in Cluster 2 (e.g., for Kim K (2013) and Andereck KL (2011)) suggest that
1990 these studies have had a substantial impact on subsequent research and are frequently co-cited with
1991 a wide range of other documents.


1992 Conclusion & Summary

1993 The co-citation network analysis reveals a structured landscape in tourism research where:

- 1994 • Cluster 1 comprises documents that form a specialized but cohesive group with moderate centrality
1995 values.
- 1996 • Cluster 2 consists of influential works that serve as important connectors within a subfield, having
1997 high betweenness and relatively high PageRank scores.
- 1998 • Cluster 3 includes seminal and widely influential documents that act as intellectual hubs, connecting
1999 diverse research streams across the field.

2000 Conclusion: The network structure underscores the multidimensional nature of tourism research. High-
2001 centrality documents—particularly those in Cluster 3—are key for bridging theoretical, methodological,
2002 and empirical studies, thereby facilitating cross-fertilization between different research areas. In contrast,
2003 Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 represent more thematically coherent or specialized sub-communities. Recognizing
2004 these clusters and the roles of the central documents can guide researchers in identifying core literature, un-
2005 derstanding the evolution of the field, and pinpointing potential areas for future interdisciplinary integration.
2006 This co-citation analysis ultimately highlights both the diversity and the interconnectedness of scholarly
2007 work in tourism research.

Node	Cluster	Betweenness	Closeness	PageRank
mccabe s 2013	1	8.13567825	0.01408451	0.032791442
gilbert d 2004	1	2.05093085	0.01408451	0.032306626
smith mk 2017	1	1.37376493	0.01333333	0.023630311
sirgy mj 2011	1	2.57914711	0.01408451	0.028918060
ryan rm 2001	1	0.59041334	0.01298701	0.020672342
diener e 1984	1	2.94837075	0.01408451	0.021816705
diener e 1985	1	2.06211332	0.01388889	0.021563742
dolnicar s 2012	1	2.20496151	0.01388889	0.023612545
neal j. 2007	1	2.44262763	0.01388889	0.022355041
kim h 2015	1	2.15748404	0.01388889	0.016424538
neal jd 1999	1	1.10825137	0.01333333	0.020395104
chen cc 2013	1	0.27368596	0.01234568	0.017925766
vada s 2019	1	0.67929012	0.01149425	0.013663794
nawijn j 2011	1	0.34075064	0.01298701	0.019849660
tung vws 2011	1	0.27495571	0.01136364	0.014357017
vada s 2020	1	0.25529349	0.01190476	0.014763601
diener e 1999	1	0.51843654	0.01315789	0.014341347
nawijn j 2010	1	0.17675153	0.01234568	0.018132765
knobloch u 2017	1	0.16742143	0.01098901	0.014845787
braun v 2021	1	0.10238199	0.01136364	0.005609378
filep s 2019	1	0.13495612	0.01176471	0.014760141
nawijn j 2016	1	0.05179224	0.01149425	0.011975171
crompton j. 1979	1	0.08168483	0.01136364	0.011027585
kim k 2013	2	14.49846610	0.01428571	0.036631436
andereck kl 2011	2	15.31186170	0.01408451	0.033818137
woo e 2015	2	9.29655539	0.01388889	0.028082940
nunkoo r 2012	2	5.22974580	0.01428571	0.024298426
andereck kl 2005	2	3.91767709	0.01408451	0.026940570
ap j 1992	2	5.14145026	0.01351351	0.026142873
sharpley r 2014	2	5.59644301	0.01408451	0.026592741
gursoy d 2002	2	2.44865406	0.01369863	0.026429417
ko dw 2002	2	1.29232730	0.01282051	0.023390456
lee th 2013	2	1.20721620	0.01250000	0.018861101
gursoy d 2004	2	0.76257229	0.01265823	0.020373880
butler rw 1980	2	0.51897650	0.01282051	0.014494988
deery m 2012	2	3.42371497	0.01449275	0.017255742
stylidis d 2014	2	1.50878773	0.01250000	0.018004666
mcgehee n. 2004	2	1.12598948	0.01250000	0.017859792
andereck k. 2000	2	0.69209167	0.01298701	0.017619651
perdue rr 1990	2	0.97211455	0.01298701	0.019061691
jurowski c. 1997	2	0.66331662	0.01265823	0.018634125
fornell c 1981	3	130.44350879	0.01724138	0.030052854
uysal m 2016	3	184.03340996	0.01754386	0.021896284
hair j.f. 2010	3	102.91273019	0.01754386	0.024334502
podsakoff pm 2003	3	Copyright @ Chad (Chungil) Chae, since 2023 27.2048312	0.01724138 0.01724138	0.016056964 ¹⁰³
anderson jc 1988	3	27.46608210	0.01724138	0.015215663
henseler j 2015	3	10.50463191	0.01724138	0.010678057
bagozzi r. 1988	3	7.59311784	0.01639344	0.011431268



2009 Historiograph

2010 Description

- 2011 1. Co-Citation Network In the co-citation network, individual documents are represented as nodes
2012 and the frequency with which they are cited together forms the links between them. Key metrics
2013 —betweenness, closeness, and PageRank—help us gauge the influence and connectivity of each pub-
2014 lication.
- 2015 • Clusters and Influential Works:
 - 2016 – The network reveals several distinct clusters (in our sample, clusters “1”, “2”, and “3”) that
2017 represent different intellectual sub-communities within the literature. For example, documents
2018 such as Fornell (1981), Uysal (2016), and Hair (2010) in Cluster 3 have exceptionally high
2019 betweenness and PageRank scores. These works are central bridging documents that are not
2020 only well cited themselves but also frequently cited together with other influential studies. Their
2021 high betweenness indicates that they connect diverse parts of the network, suggesting that they
2022 serve as foundational references that have shaped multiple strands of research.
- 2023 • Centrality Measures:
 - 2024 – Betweenness Centrality shows the role of a document as an intermediary between other works.
2025 Higher values (as seen with Fornell and Uysal) imply that these papers act as important con-
2026 ducts through which ideas and methods disseminate. Closeness Centrality indicates how near

- a document is to all others in the network, with most values clustering in a narrow band. This implies that, while differences exist, the network is relatively compact.
- PageRank reflects the overall “prestige” or influence of a paper. Documents with higher PageRank, particularly in Cluster 3, are influential in the sense that they are cited by other highly cited works.
 - Overall, the co-citation analysis suggests that seminal publications serve as intellectual hubs. They not only anchor their respective subfields but also bridge across them, facilitating the diffusion of ideas in the broader domain of tourism, quality of life, and well-being research.

2. Factorial Analysis on Keywords The factorial analysis on keywords investigates the underlying dimensions that organize the intellectual content of the field. In the provided table:

- Dimensions (Factors):

- The keywords have been projected onto two dimensions (Dim1 and Dim2) that capture patterns of co-occurrence and semantic similarity across the literature. For instance:
- Keywords such as “quality.of.life”, “perceptions”, “attitudes”, “support”, “impacts” show strong negative loadings on the first dimension. This grouping may represent a critical or evaluative dimension in which the literature focuses on the challenges or complexities of assessing quality of life and subjective well-being.
- In contrast, keywords such as “happiness”, “health”, “experiences”, “leisure”, “benefits”, “vacation”, and “positive.psychology” tend to have positive loadings on the first and second dimensions. This pattern suggests a complementary perspective emphasizing the positive and experiential aspects of tourism and its contribution to well-being.

- Thematic Grouping:

- The factorial solution appears to cluster together terms that reflect both the evaluative (e.g., perceptions, attitudes, and negative aspects like stress or constraints) and the experiential (e.g., happiness, health, leisure, and benefits) sides of the literature. This dual structure underscores the multidimensionality of research in tourism: while some works scrutinize the challenges and potential negative impacts (or the critical evaluation of quality-of-life metrics), others highlight the positive outcomes and benefits that travel and leisure experiences can offer.

- Document Contributions:

- A complementary analysis of documents (Table 2) shows how individual papers load on these dimensions. Papers with strong positive contributions might represent research that emphasizes the uplifting and beneficial outcomes of travel experiences, whereas those with negative loadings may address challenges, limitations, or areas for improvement in assessing tourism’s impact on quality of life.

Conclusion & Summary

The combined analyses reveal a rich, interconnected intellectual landscape in tourism and well-being research:

- Co-citation Network:

2065 – The network structure, through its clusters and centrality measures, indicates that the field is
2066 anchored by several seminal works—especially in Cluster 3—that serve as critical hubs linking
2067 diverse research streams. These influential documents act as bridges, disseminating ideas across
2068 the field and underpinning both methodological and conceptual advances. Meanwhile, other
2069 clusters represent more specialized thematic groups that address specific aspects of tourism's
2070 impact on quality of life.


2071 • Factorial Analysis on Keywords:

2072 – The keyword analysis uncovers two main dimensions that represent opposing yet complemen-
2073 tary perspectives. One dimension is characterized by critical evaluative terms (such as negative
2074 perceptions, stress, or constraints) while the other highlights the positive, experiential outcomes
2075 (including happiness, health, leisure, and benefits). This duality reflects the inherent complexity
2076 of tourism research, where studies balance assessments of both the challenges and the enriching
2077 aspects of travel experiences.

2078 • Conclusion:

2079 – Taken together, these analyses demonstrate that tourism research is multifaceted—both in its
2080 intellectual structure and in its thematic content. The co□citation network identifies key pub-
2081 lications that have significantly influenced the field and act as linchpins connecting various
2082 research areas. Simultaneously, the factorial analysis of keywords reveals a nuanced interplay
2083 between critical evaluation and the celebration of positive experiences. Recognizing these pat-
2084 terns can help researchers, practitioners, and policymakers better understand the evolution of
2085 the field, identify core literature and emerging trends, and foster further interdisciplinary inte-
2086 gration. This comprehensive insight supports more informed decisions in research direction,
2087 policy formulation, and the practical application of tourism and well□being studies.

Paper	Title
GILBERT D, 2004, ANN TOURISM RES DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2003.06.001	HOLIDAYTAKING AND UNDERSTANDING THE TOWARD A QUALITY-OF-LIFE
MCCABE S, 2010, INT J TOUR RES DOI 10.1002/JTR.791	THE HOLIDAY HAPPINESS DETERMINANTS OF DAY
SIRGY MJ, 2010, J TRAVEL RES DOI 10.1177/0047287509337416	HOW DOES A TRAVEL EXPLORING THE NATURAL RESIDENT ATTITUDES
NAWIJN J, 2010, INT J TOUR RES DOI 10.1002/JTR.756	THE CONTRIBUTION OF VACATION AND WELL-BEING
NAWIJN J, 2011, J TRAVEL RES DOI 10.1177/0047287510379164	HOW DO WE FEEL ON THE HAPPINESS FACTORS
SIRGY MJ, 2011, J TRAVEL RES DOI 10.1177/0047287510362784	VACATION AND WELL-BEING
ANDERECK KL, 2011, J TRAVEL RES DOI 10.1177/0047287510362918	HEALTH AND WELLBEING
NAWIJN J, 2012, J TRAVEL RES DOI 10.1177/0047287511426482	HOW DOES TOURISM IMPACT HOST PERCEPTIONS OF MOVING BEYOND SUBJECTIVE
DOLNICAR S, 2012, ANN TOURISM RES DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2011.04.015	TOURISM EXPERIENCES
NAWIJN J, 2013, J TRAVEL RES DOI 10.1177/0047287512465961	SOCIAL TOURISM AND LIFE SATISFACTION AND
MCCABE S, 2013, ANN TOURISM RES DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2012.12.001	QUALITY OF LIFE (QOL)
CHEN Y, 2013, ANN TOURISM RES DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2013.02.003	TOURISM DEVELOPMENT
CHEN CC, 2013, J TRAVEL RES DOI 10.1177/0047287513496477	IMPACTS OF FESTIVAL
KIM K, 2013, TOURISM MANAGE DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2012.09.005	RESIDENTS' QUALITY OF LIFE
SHARPLEY R, 2014, TOURISM MANAGE DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2013.10.007	EXPLORING WELL-BEING
FILEP S, 2014, J HOSP TOUR RES DOI 10.1177/1096348012436609	EXPERIENCE, EMOTIONS
KIM H, 2015, TOURISM MANAGE DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2014.08.002	TOURISM AND WELLBEING
MORGAN N, 2015, ANN TOURISM RES DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2015.02.015	TOURISM IMPACT AND TRENDS
WOO E, 2015, ANN TOURISM RES DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2014.11.001	PROMOTING QUALITY OF LIFE
UYDAL M, 2016, TOURISM MANAGE DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2015.07.013	POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGY
RIVERA M, 2016, J DESTIN MARK MANAGE DOI 10.1016/J.JDMM.2015.04.002	
YOLAL M, 2016, ANN TOURISM RES DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2016.07.008	
LIANG ZX, 2016, TOURISM MANAGE DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2016.05.001	
PYKE S, 2016, TOURISM MANAGE DOI 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2016.02.004	
KNOBLOCH U, 2017, J TRAVEL RES DOI 10.1177/0047287516650937	
SMITH MK, 2017, ANN TOURISM RES DOI 10.1016/J.ANNALS.2017.05.006	
WOO E, 2018, J HOSP TOUR RES DOI 10.1177/1096348016654971	
FILEP S, 2019, J TRAVEL RES DOI 10.1177/0047287518759227	
SIRGY MJ, 2019, J TRAVEL TOUR MARK DOI 10.1080/10548408.2018.1526757	
VADA S, 2020, TOUR MANAG PERSPECT DOI 10.1016/J.TMP.2019.100631	



2089 Social Structure**2090 Collaboration Network**

2091 The given data presents a bibliometric analysis of the author collaboration network on the topic. The metrics
2092 included are betweenness, closeness, and PageRank. Let's delve into an interpretation of the results:

2093 Description

2094 The collaboration network represents how authors are connected through co-authorship relationships. Each
2095 node is an individual researcher, and the network is partitioned into several clusters (labeled here by num-
2096 bers). In this dataset, nodes are characterized by several centrality measures:

- 2097 • Betweenness Centrality: Indicates an author's role as a "bridge" or connector between otherwise
2098 separate parts of the network. High betweenness suggests that an author plays a key role in linking
2099 different collaboration groups.
- 2100 • Closeness Centrality: Reflects how "close" an author is to all other authors in the network. A higher
2101 closeness value means that the author is well-positioned to quickly interact or share information with
2102 others.
- 2103 • PageRank: Captures the overall "influence" or prestige of the author within the network, taking into
2104 account not only the number but also the importance of collaborators.

2105 The network is divided into several clusters (e.g., Cluster 1, Cluster 2, Cluster 3, etc.), suggesting that
2106 researchers tend to collaborate within certain groups. For example, Cluster 1 includes nodes like Zhang Y,
2107 Gao J, Lee TJ, and Chen CC, while Cluster 2 is characterized by authors such as Kim S, Lee CK, Han H,
2108 and Ramkissoon H.

2109 Interpretation**2110 1. Key Connectors and Influencers:**

- 2111 • Zhang Y (Cluster 1) shows the highest betweenness in its cluster (≈ 72.67), which means that this
2112 author often serves as a bridge between otherwise disconnected groups. In addition, a high PageRank
2113 (≈ 0.0346) further underscores Zhang Y's influential position.
- 2114 • In Cluster 2, authors like Kim S, Lee CK, Han H, and Ramkissoon H also have high betweenness
2115 values and relatively high closeness scores, indicating that this group is not only tightly knit but also
2116 well connected to other parts of the network.
- 2117 • Uysal M in Cluster 10 stands out with a high betweenness of about 74.31 and an impressive PageRank
2118 of nearly 0.06, suggesting that Uysal is a central figure in a distinct collaboration sub-community,
2119 acting as both a hub and a bridge to other groups.

2120 2. Cluster Characteristics:

- 2121 • Clusters 1 and 2 appear to be the most densely interconnected, with multiple nodes exhibiting sim-
2122 ilar closeness and PageRank values. These clusters likely represent established research groups or
2123 long-standing collaborative networks in the field.

- 2124 • Clusters with lower node counts or with nodes showing very low betweenness (for example, some
2125 nodes in Clusters 4 or 5 where betweenness is 0) may represent peripheral groups or newer collabo-
2126 rations that are not yet well integrated into the broader network.

2127 3. Overall Connectivity:

- 2128 • The variation in closeness centrality (ranging roughly from 0.005 to 0.012 in most cases) suggests
2129 that, on average, authors are not very “distant” from each other—indicating a relatively compact
2130 network structure. This compactness can facilitate the rapid dissemination of ideas and collaborative
2131 practices across the field.
2132 • PageRank scores, although varying, help identify which authors are cited or recognized frequently by
2133 other influential authors. For instance, Uysal M’s relatively high PageRank in Cluster 10 is indicative
2134 of his significant impact within that sub-community.

2135 **Conclusion & Summary**


2136 The collaboration network reveals a multi-cluster structure, highlighting both well-established research
2137 groups and more peripheral or emerging clusters. Key authors such as Zhang Y (Cluster 1), Kim S (Cluster
2138 2), and Uysal M (Cluster 10) act as critical connectors and influencers within their groups. High between-
2139 ness and PageRank values for these nodes indicate that they not only facilitate collaborations within their
2140 own clusters but also serve as bridges to other parts of the network. Closeness centrality values show that
2141 most authors are relatively near to one another in terms of collaborative reach, reinforcing the notion of a
2142 densely interconnected research community.

2143 • Conclusion:

- 2144 – The analysis of the collaboration network provides valuable insights into the structure and dy-
2145 namics of research collaboration in this domain. Key findings include:
2146 * The presence of distinct collaboration clusters, each with its own set of influential authors.
2147 * Several central figures (high betweenness and PageRank) play pivotal roles in connecting
2148 disparate groups, suggesting that fostering collaborations with these individuals could en-
2149 hance interdisciplinary and cross-cluster research.
2150 * The relatively compact nature of the network implies that innovations and methodological
2151 advancements can spread rapidly through these collaborations.

2152 Overall, the collaboration network reflects a vibrant and interconnected research community. By identi-
2153 fying the key players and understanding the collaborative structure, researchers and decision-makers can
2154 better design strategies for knowledge sharing, resource allocation, and the promotion of interdisciplinary
2155 studies.

params	values	X3	X4
lee tj	1	29	6.3291139240506302E-3
chen cc	1	33.3333333333333	7.4626865671641798E-3
petrick jf	1	0	6.2893081761006301E-3
lee j	1	0	5.3475935828877002E-3
kim s	2	97.846153846153896	1.0869565217391301E-2
lee ck	2	79.571428571428598	9.7087378640776708E-3
han h	2	49.571428571428598	9.7087378640776708E-3
ramkissoon h	2	49.725274725274701	9.1743119266054999E-3
xiao hg	2	227	1.1764705882352899E-2
kim j	2	180.131868131868	1.1764705882352899E-2
law r	2	0	7.5757575757575803E-3
wong ia	2	0	8.7719298245613996E-3
wang yc	3	151.333333333333	9.1743119266054999E-3
croes r	3	0	6.7567567567567597E-3
fu xx	3	209.333333333333	1.0638297872340399E-2
ridderstaat j	3	43	8.4033613445378096E-3
fyall a	3	4.6666666666666696	7.4626865671641798E-3
alrawadieh z	4	0	1
altinay l	4	0	1
sthapit e	5	0	1
björk p	5	0	1
rasoolimanesh sm	6	29	7.09219858156028E-3
jaafar m	6	0	5.8823529411764696E-3
woosnam km	7	109.153846153846	8.7719298245613996E-3
pinto p	7	0	7.0422535211267599E-3
boley bb	7	0	7.0422535211267599E-3
su lj	8	2	0.25
nawijn j	8	2	0.25
mitas o	8	0	0.16666666666666699
huang ss	8	0	0.16666666666666699
filep s	9	2	0.3333333333333298
vada s	9	0	0.25
wu my	9	0	0.2
mackenzie sh	9	0	0.25
uysal m	10	74.314285714285703	1.02040816326531E-2
kim h	10	15.685714285714299	9.4339622641509396E-3
sirgy mj	10	0	7.9365079365079395E-3
berbekova a	10	0	7.9365079365079395E-3
gursoy d	10	0	7.9365079365079395E-3
chen y	11	0	6.7567567567567597E-3
lehto xy	11	29	8.4033613445378096E-3
prayag g	12	0	1
jordan ej	12	0	1
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA



2156

2157 **Countries' Collaboration World Map**

2158 The dataset offers a broad view of the collaborations between countries in the field. The frequencies indicate
 2159 the number of times scholars from two countries have co-authored papers. In this case, the majority of
 2160 collaborations have a frequency of 1, meaning that many pairs of countries have collaborated once.

2161 **Description**2162 **1. High-Frequency Links**

- 2163 • China → USA (91 collaborations) is by far the most frequently observed connection, indicating a
 2164 very strong research or project link between these two countries.
- 2165 • China → Australia (65) and Australia → United Kingdom (14) also stand out, suggesting that these
 2166 triads (China–USA, China–Australia, and Australia–UK) form a major hub of collaboration.
- 2167 • The United Kingdom → South Africa (15) and Australia → South Africa (11) links highlight sub-
 2168 stantial ties between parts of Europe, Oceania, and Africa.

2169 **2. Regional Clusters**

- 2170 • The table shows many intra-Asia or Asia–Pacific collaborations: for instance, Australia with vari-
 2171 ous Asia-Pacific nations (e.g., Malaysia, New Zealand, Korea) and China with countries like Korea,
 2172 Malaysia, and Japan.
- 2173 • There are also strong Europe-based clusters. For instance, Finland has multiple connections to Ger-
 2174 many, Sweden, Estonia, etc., and Spain has multiple links across Europe (Portugal, France, Germany,
 2175 etc.).

2176 3. North–South Collaborations

- 2177 • The data indicates many cross-hemisphere partnerships, such as: USA collaborating with countries
2178 in Africa (South Africa, Ghana, Egypt) and Latin America (Mexico, Chile).
2179 • United Kingdom partnering with countries in Asia (India, Malaysia, Thailand), the Middle East
2180 (Oman, Saudi Arabia), and Africa (South Africa, Ghana).

2181 4. Notable Emerging Collaborations

- 2182 • Some countries that might not be as frequently highlighted in global research contexts appear here
2183 with multiple ties, e.g., Pakistan, Oman, and Rwanda, each collaborating with various countries.
2184 • Countries such as Vietnam and Indonesia show collaborations across multiple continents, including
2185 Europe, Asia, and Oceania.

2186 **Interpretation**

2187 • Major Global Hubs

- 2188 – USA, China, Australia, and the United Kingdom appear to be central hubs in this network.
2189 They have numerous high-frequency links spanning different continents, suggesting a broad
2190 international footprint in collaborative work.

2191 • Strong Asia–Pacific Ties

- 2192 – Collaboration among China, Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, and others in this region
2193 is robust. This reflects a well-connected research environment in the Asia–Pacific.

2194 • Europe’s Multiple Clusters

- 2195 – Many European countries (e.g., Finland, Germany, Spain, Portugal) have wide-reaching collabora-
2196 tions both within Europe and internationally (Latin America, Africa, and Asia).

2197 • Africa’s Rising Presence

- 2198 – South Africa stands out as a key collaborator in Africa, linking with the UK, USA, Malaysia,
2199 Norway, and more. There are also smaller but noteworthy collaborations involving countries
2200 like Ghana, Ethiopia, Rwanda, and Mauritius.


2201 • Opportunities for New Links

- 2202 – While some country pairs show strong existing collaboration, others appear only once, indicat-
2203 ing potential for expansion. Low-frequency edges might be starting points for growing cross-
2204 national research partnerships.

2205 **Conclusion & Summary**

- 2206 • This collaboration dataset reveals a complex, global network of partnerships. Certain countries, such
2207 as China, USA, Australia, and the United Kingdom, dominate with many high-frequency collabo-
2208 rations. Regions like Asia–Pacific and Europe show strong intra-regional and inter-regional links,
2209 while African and Latin American countries also appear as strategic partners in multiple contexts.

- 2210 • Overall, the data underscores the highly interconnected nature of global research and project collabora-
2211 tions. It can guide future policy decisions, research funding, and institution-level strategies aiming
2212 to foster international partnerships and bridge any existing gaps in the global network.



2213

From	To	Frequency
AUSTRALIA	CANADA	3
AUSTRALIA	CHILE	3
AUSTRALIA	IRAN	3
AUSTRALIA	KOREA	5
AUSTRALIA	MALAYSIA	15
AUSTRALIA	MAURITIUS	3
AUSTRALIA	NEW ZEALAND	10
AUSTRALIA	SOUTH AFRICA	11
AUSTRALIA	SPAIN	3
AUSTRALIA	THAILAND	4
AUSTRALIA	UNITED KINGDOM	14
AUSTRALIA	VIETNAM	3
CHINA	AUSTRALIA	65
CHINA	AUSTRIA	4
CHINA	CANADA	10
CHINA	FRANCE	3
CHINA	GHANA	4
CHINA	INDONESIA	3
CHINA	JAPAN	4
CHINA	KOREA	32
CHINA	MALAYSIA	11
CHINA	NETHERLANDS	4
CHINA	NEW ZEALAND	10
CHINA	NORWAY	3
CHINA	PAKISTAN	6
CHINA	SINGAPORE	8
CHINA	SOUTH AFRICA	11
CHINA	SPAIN	3
CHINA	UNITED KINGDOM	36
CHINA	USA	91
FINLAND	SWEDEN	3
FRANCE	IRAN	3
GERMANY	SWITZERLAND	3
ITALY	NETHERLANDS	3
KOREA	JAPAN	3
KOREA	MALAYSIA	5
KOREA	SOUTH AFRICA	4
MALAYSIA	FINLAND	3
MALAYSIA	SOUTH AFRICA	7
NETHERLANDS	FINLAND	4
NEW ZEALAND	FINLAND	3
NEW ZEALAND	MALAYSIA	4
NEW ZEALAND	SWEDEN	3
PAKISTAN	SAUDI ARABIA	3
PORTUGAL	BRAZIL	6
RUSSIA	SERBIA	4
SOUTH AFRICA	GHANA	4
SOUTH AFRICA	MAURITIUS	3

2214 Discussion of the bibliometrics**2215 Discussion of the bibliometrics**

2216 The analysis report (Chae, 2025a) offers a comprehensive bibliometric examination of the literature on
2217 tourists' experiences and happiness. It employs performance indicators, co-citation analyses, and thematic
2218 mappings to reveal publication trends, identify influential authors and journals, and elucidate the conceptual
2219 and intellectual structures that define this research domain. Overall, it shows an initial, gradual increase in
2220 publications in the early 2000s, followed by a sharp rise in recent years, signaling widespread scholarly and
2221 societal interest in how tourism intersects with well-being. Older publications consistently demonstrate
2222 higher citation counts, reflecting their foundational impact. Key journals such as *Tourism Management*,
2223 *Journal of Travel Research*, and *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* play a central role in disseminating signifi-
2224 cant findings, while researchers like Uysal, Filep, and Kim appear repeatedly as leading figures, suggesting
2225 a concentration of expertise and influence. The analysis also highlights extensive international collabora-
2226 tion—spanning China, the United States, and Australia—underscoring the global scope of tourism research
2227 and the multifaceted ways it addresses quality of life, subjective well-being, and holistic travel experiences.
2228 Two principal thematic clusters emerge. One focuses on macro-level constructs such as quality of life,
2229 community impacts, and satisfaction, while the other centers on micro-level, traveler-centric themes such
2230 as health, happiness, and experiential outcomes. Factor analysis adds nuance to these findings, indicating
2231 that hedonic (pleasure-oriented) and eudaimonic (meaning-oriented) perspectives both occupy prominent
2232 positions in scholarly discussions of tourist well-being.

- 2233 • Relevant Arguments Findings shows emphasizing the need to move beyond tourism's economic or
2234 recreational aspects and to integrate subjective well-being and life satisfaction into the scholarly lens.
2235 The proposal advocates a holistic, interdisciplinary framework that brings together psychology, eco-
2236 nomics, sociology, and management to study hedonic and eudaimonic aspects. Similarly, the anal-
2237 ysis report indicates that tourism studies are increasingly investigating subjective constructs such as
2238 quality of life, satisfaction, and happiness, although these efforts sometimes remain fragmented and
2239 isolated. Both sources suggest that comprehensive research on tourism and happiness has the poten-
2240 tial to shape more robust policies, industry practices, and cross-disciplinary collaborations that can
2241 improve overall quality of life for travelers and host communities.

2242 • Research Questions and Finidngs

- 2243 – RQ1: Do Tourism Experiences Enhance Subjective Well-Being? The proposal posits that
2244 tourism positively influences subjective well-being, asserting that travel boosts happiness and
2245 life satisfaction. The analysis report (Chae, 2025a) confirms that many studies document height-
2246 ened happiness around trips, a phenomenon sometimes termed the “vacation effect.” It does,
2247 however, highlight that this uplift may be short-lived, with happiness levels eventually reverting
2248 to baseline. Nonetheless, it also notes that certain meaningful or “eudaimonic” travel experi-
2249 ences can create deeper and longer-lasting gains. These findings validate the proposal’s funda-
2250 mental assumption about a positive tourism–happiness link but also stress that duration and
2251 intensity of the benefit depend on how and why people travel.
- 2252 – RQ2: Which Factors in Tourism Experiences Most Influence Happiness? The proposal un-
2253 derscores factors like destination quality, enjoyment, and safety as primary drivers of tourist

happiness. In alignment with this view, the bibliometric analysis pinpoints environmental quality, destination image, risk perception, and authenticity of the travel experience as central to well-being (Chae, 2025a). Overcrowding is identified as a negative influence, especially under conditions of overtourism. In addition, the discussion of safety—particularly in light of global health events—underscores the importance of contextual variables. These observations reinforce the proposal's argument while broadening its scope: beyond mere enjoyment or good service, factors like social environment and health-related safeguards are indispensable for ensuring a truly satisfying trip.

- RQ3: How Do Scholars Conceptualize and Measure Tourist Happiness? The proposal suggests a positive-psychology framework incorporating both hedonic and eudaimonic dimensions. The analysis report (Chae, 2025a) shows that the field largely adopts Diener's (1984) Subjective Well-Being constructs, blending positive affect, negative affect, and cognitive life satisfaction. Measures such as the Life Satisfaction Scale frequently appear, reflecting a primarily subjective, survey-based methodology. Many researchers also explore deeper, purpose-driven experiences, thus affirming the proposal's view that happiness is more than a fleeting emotion; rather, it can involve personal growth and meaning. These findings confirm that tourism scholars prioritize psychological scales and models of well-being, lending empirical support to the proposal's approach.
- RQ4: What Are the Major Research Gaps and Future Directions? The proposal argues that tourism-happiness research remains fragmented and requires interdisciplinary integration. The bibliometric analysis confirms this fragmentation while identifying trends such as sustainability, technology-driven experiences, and global risk factors (Chae, 2025a). Sustainability issues appear increasingly central, as do the psychological and behavioral effects of crises like the COVID-19 pandemic. Emerging questions also concern digital tourism and how online platforms can shape or mediate tourist well-being. These gaps and emerging foci echo the proposal's call for an integrative framework that spans economics, sociology, public health, and psychology. The analysis thereby extends the proposal's recommendations by highlighting specific under-studied domains—particularly the long-term psychological consequences of travel disruptions and the evolving influence of virtual reality on tourist experiences.

Discussio Points

Relevant Arguments:

Both documents assert that tourism goes well beyond its traditional role as a recreational or economic activity. The analysis report demonstrates—with extensive performance, network, and thematic mapping analyses—that research in tourism is increasingly concerned with how travel experiences shape subjective well-being, quality of life, and overall happiness. In parallel, the proposal argues that the field remains fragmented, with isolated studies examining hedonic (pleasure-focused) versus eudaimonic (meaning-focused) aspects. Together, they build a case for a more holistic understanding of tourism's multifaceted impact on human well-being. This perspective is essential as it calls for integrating both psychological and socio-economic dimensions to inform policy, practice, and further academic inquiry.

Potential Research Questions:

Drawing on the identified gaps and emerging trends, several research questions naturally arise: • How do distinct travel experiences differentially influence hedonic and eudaimonic well-being? • What psychological mechanisms mediate the relationship between tourism and overall quality of life? • In what ways do demographic, cultural, and digital factors (e.g., the role of virtual reality) moderate the impact of tourism on happiness? • How can integrated bibliometric and qualitative methodologies further refine our understanding of the evolving intellectual structure in tourism research?

Interdisciplinary Implications:

Both documents highlight the inherently interdisciplinary nature of studying tourism and happiness. By merging perspectives from positive psychology, economics, sociology, and management, the research field is poised to develop richer, more nuanced models of well-being. This interdisciplinary approach not only enhances theoretical development but also offers practical benefits for policymakers and industry stakeholders. For example, insights from the analysis report—through network and factorial analyses—show how diverse academic traditions intersect, suggesting that collaboration across fields can drive innovations in both tourism experience design and well-being enhancement.

Methodological Challenges and Innovations:

A recurring theme is the challenge of synthesizing a fragmented literature that spans multiple disciplines and employs varied methodologies. One of the main challenges is operationalizing subjective constructs like happiness and well-being in a standardized and comparable way. On the innovation front, the proposal advocates for a combination of bibliometric methods, qualitative content analysis, and machine-learning techniques (such as structural topic modeling) to map research trends and uncover latent intellectual structures. The analysis report further demonstrates how network analyses (co-citation, bibliographic coupling) and factorial analyses can reveal the underpinnings of tourism research. These methodological innovations not only help in capturing complex interrelations but also pave the way for more robust, data-driven evaluations of how tourism contributes to happiness.

Conclusion of the bibliometrics analysis

- The bibliometric analysis report and the research proposal collectively illuminate a maturing yet still evolving scholarly landscape. A core consensus emerges that tourism experiences do, in fact, enhance happiness, albeit through varying degrees of hedonic and eudaimonic pathways. The field's conceptual and methodological foundations rest upon well-established positive-psychology measures, although new lines of inquiry—such as sustainability, risk perception, and digital transformation—point to a broader, interdisciplinary perspective. Both documents underscore the importance of situating tourism within a more holistic, life-satisfaction context that accounts for cultural, social, and psychological complexities. The analysis confirms the proposal's argument that tourism research now recognizes human well-being as a crucial outcome of travel experiences, but it also reveals areas where research remains patchy, calling for innovative, data-driven methods and collaborative

2329 theoretical models. By uniting insights from the proposal's theoretical roadmap with the analysis re-
2330 port's empirical mapping, scholars and practitioners can more effectively harness tourism's potential
2331 to foster and sustain human happiness in a rapidly changing global environment.

- 2332 • In conclusion, findings converge on the need for a comprehensive, integrative approach to studying
2333 the relationship between tourism and happiness. The relevant arguments call for moving beyond
2334 narrow, isolated studies toward a multidimensional framework that accounts for both immediate and
2335 lasting impacts on well-being. Future research should address the proposed questions, embrace inter-
2336 disciplinary methodologies, and overcome challenges related to data standardization and integration.
2337 Together, these efforts can deepen our understanding of tourism's transformative potential for en-
2338 hancing quality of life, guiding both academic research and practical interventions in the tourism
2339 industry.

2340 Topic Modeling**2341 Preprocessing****2342 Optimal K****2343 Modeling****2344 Final Model Modeling****2345 Final Model Validation****2346 Effect****2347 Findings (Main)****2348 Topic Result****2349 Proportion****2350 Topic Comparision****2351 Topic Labeling****2352 Initial Label****2353 Update Label from User****2354 Additional Findings (Analysis with Covariates)****2355 Covariate (time)****2356 Covariate (Categorical)****2357 Covariate (Interaction Term)****2358 Topic Network Analysis****2359 LDAVIS**

2360 **Discussion of the Topic Modeling**

2361 **Relevant Arguments:**

2362 **Potential Research Questions:**

2363 **Three discussion points:**

2364 **Discussion point1**

2365 **Discussion point2**

2366 **Discussion point3**

2367 **Conclusion of the Topic Modeling**

2368 **Discussion**

2369 **Conclusion**

2370 **References**